FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

19 Aug 87 FBIS-SOV-87-160 i

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Gerasimov Ponders GDR Arms To Counter FRG Pershings [Hamburg BILD 19 Aug] AA 1
Karpov: Make Pershing Decision 'Without Delay' AA 1
Shultz Pershing Letter Shows U.S. 'Passed Buck' [DPA] AA 2
FRG Politicians Show 'No Unanimity' on Pershing Issue [Aksenov] AA 2
IZVESTIYA Reports Briefing on Radiation From Blast [18 Aug] AA 3
Nazarkin Views Chemical Arms Verification [Paris LE FIGARO 17 Aug] AA 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds Ministry Press Briefing 18 Aug CC 1
Denies U.S. Campaign Interference CC 1
Eyes Hayden's Pacific Peace Plans CC 1
Adamishin Discusses Rights at 18 Aug Briefing CC 2
Views Proposed Conference CC 2
Comments on Soviet Psychiatry CC 3
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Charikov, Grigoryev, Tsoppi] CC 4
'Studio 9' Panel Discusses Helsinki Final Act [Zorin, Kovalev, Grachev] CC 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Arbatov, Moynihan Interviewed on Pershings A 1
PRAVDA UKRAINY Reports U.S. Envoy's Kiev Visit A 2
Attends Exhibition Ceremony [15 Aug] A 2
Talks With Officials [15 Aug] A 3
Matveyev Deplores Reagan Berlin Wall Remarks [IZVESTIYA 12 Aug] A 3
Zorin Ponders U.S. Officials' Anti-Soviet Remarks A 4
U.S. Appointee to UN Commission 'Hates Cuba' A 5
Washington To Continue Aid to Nicaraguan Contras A 6

NORTHEAST ASIA

Protests, Strikes in South Korea Continue C 1

NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

Iranian Ambassador's Meeting in Moscow Reported [Tehran] E 1
IZVESTIYA Notes Rafsanjani Remarks on Mines [18 Aug] E 1
Liberian Tanker Fired Upon in Gulf of Oman E 2
Western Media Cited on Gulf, Public Reactions E 2
PDPA Approves Results of Najib-Gorbachev Meeting E 4
Pakistani, Mujahidin 'Goons' Attack Pushtun Tribes [IZVESTIYA 6 Aug] E 4
India's 40th Independence Anniversary Hailed [Biryukov] E 6
Commentary Views Chemical Weapons in Middle East E 7
PLO's Qaddumi Sends Message to Foreign Minister [Algiers Voice of Palestine] E 8
Start of U.S.-Egypt 'Bright Star' Exercises Noted E 9

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Commentary Lauds Afrikaners at Dakar ANC Meeting F 1

EAST EUROPE

Polish Reforms Increase Role of Sejm [IZVESTIYA 13 Aug] G 1
U.S. Paper Criticized for Item on Solidarity [SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 1 Aug] G 1

WEST EUROPE

Further on Hess Death, Spandau's Destruction H 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

12 Peasants Killed by Somozists Near Matiguas I 1
Demichev Receives Guatemalan Parliamentarians [IZVESTIYA 12 Aug] I 1
IZVESTIYA Interviews Guatemalan Politicians [11 Aug] I 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL

Ukrainian Politburo Chides Railroad Officials [PRAVDA UKRAINY 13 Aug] R 1
Kirgiz Plenum Criticizes 'Inertia,' 'Blunders' [PRAVDA 16 Aug] R 2
Writer Calls for 'Monument' to Stalin's Victims [AFP] R 4
Youth Labor Camp Regime, Conditions Described [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Aug] R 5
Vostrukhov Notes Western View of Soviet Hijacker [IZVESTIYA 10 Aug] R 9

ECONOMIC

Aganbegyan Interviewed on Restructuring S 1
[Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 12 Aug]
Second Part of Interview S 4
[Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO 13 Aug]
Minister Outlines Problems in Machine Building S 6
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 8 Aug]
Jan-Jul Industrial Performance Assessed S 9
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 12 Aug]
Briefs: Arctic Oil Field S 10

SCIENTIFIC

Soviet-Led Researchers Synthesize New Element U 1
Briefs: Alma-Ata Seismic Station U 1

MILITARY

Air Fleet Day Marked by Displays, Speeches V 1
Officials Attend Air Show V 1
Yefimov Addresses Meeting V 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Aug]
Yefimov Delivers Speech V 1
Further Reportage on Carpathian Military Exercises V 5
'High Level of Combat Training' V 5
Will Work on 'Cooperation' V 5

GERASIMOV PONDERS GDR ARMS TO COUNTER FRG PERSHINGS

DW190711 Hamburg BILD in German 19 Aug 87 p 2

[Interview with "Kremlin Spokesman" Gennadiy Gerasimov by correspondent "WKE," date and place not given]

[Text] The position of the Americans that the Bundeswehr's Pershing-1A missiles cannot become the subject of the Geneva disarmament talks is "illogical," Kremlin Spokesman Gerasimov told BILD.

He said: "We want to have a genuine zero solution for the medium-range systems in Europe. One cannot be half a virgin. It is all or nothing."

BILD: So the Geneva negotiations will fail?

Gerasimov: "We want the medium-range agreement and I think they Americans want it too. The Americans must now say in Geneva how they visualize an agreement. The 72 Pershing-1A missiles remain an obstacle for us.

"However, if the West insists of them, we will have to deploy the same number and kind of missiles in the 'GDR' and make those missiles available to the 'GDR'. I believe that nobody in the West wants that."

KARPOV: MAKE PERSHING DECISION 'WITHOUT DELAY'

LD181250 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 18 Aug 87

["Pershing-1A Missiles -- Urgent Problem" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- A decision on the problem of West German Pershing-1A missiles and American warheads for them should be taken without delay, Viktor Karpov, head of the department for the arms limitation and disarmament problems of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, stated today in an interview with the TASS diplomatic correspondent.

At present preparations are under way for a meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and George Shultz, U.S. secretary of state, which is planned to be held in Washington in mid-September, this year. The meeting should be prepared in such a way that it could bring positive results. It is hardly sensible to leave the problem of West German Pershing-1A missiles and American warheads for them till the meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state.

If in the coming several weeks the Governments of the United States and West Germany do not display a necessary sense of responsibility, understanding, as well as goodwill, if real prospects do not emerge of the settlement of the Pershing-1A problem, the question will naturally arise whether it will be possible to resolve this problem during the coming meeting of Eduard Shevardnadze and George Shultz and whether the meeting itself will be expedient in this case, the Soviet expert said. It is hardly reasonable to burden the ministers with the search for the working whose working out will not be ensured beforehand by the coordination in principles of the stands of both sides. Thus, it is the turn of Washington and Bonn to reciprocate.

SHULTZ PERSHING LETTER SHOWS U.S. 'PASSED BUCK'

LD181127 Hamburg DPA in German 1026 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Bonn (DPA) -- From the Soviet Union's view, the letter from U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz to his German counterpart, Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) [Free Democratic Party] means the Americans "have passed the buck to the FRG" as far as the disarmament issue involving the old Pershing-1A missiles are concerned. This was said by a Soviet expert on Germany, Nikolay Portugalov, in an interview with Radio Luxembourg (RTL) today. The advisor at the Soviet Central Committee repeated the Soviet standpoint that the carrier systems of the Federal Army's Pershing-1A's "are of no interest whatever to us."

However, the nuclear warheads under U.S. control belong in the Soviet-U.S. medium-range missile negotiations in Geneva. If the United States agrees to a differentation between carriers and warheads "then there is practically no further obstacle to an agreement on the double-zero solution," Portugalov said.

It was learned in Bonn that Shultz replied to a letter from Genscher of 7 August in which the Federal foreign minister rejected the accusations made by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on 6 August at the UN disarmament conference in which the Federal Republic was accused of blocking the disarmament negotiations by its attitude to the Pershing-1A missiles. In this letter, which, just like the Shultz reply of 14 August, has so far not been published, Genscher pointed out both the unanimous view of the alliance on this issue as well as the overwhelming common interest of the alliance in medium-range missile disarmament. In the view of political observers, Shultz's assurance that the Pershing-1A missiles were not the subject of negotiations merely reiterated the old starting position of the Geneva negotiations. Both Genscher and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl (CDU) [Christian Democratic Union] have in the meantime said the Federal Government will do "everything" to ensure success at the Geneva negotiations.

Bonn/Stuttgart (DPA) -- Willi Wimmer, defense spokesman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] Bundestag group, has warned against the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Federal Republic. During a visit to the Stuttgart headquarters of the U.S. Armed Forces in Europe today, Wimmer pointed out that there is some concern in the U.S. Congress about U.S. involvement in favor of other crisis points in the world. In view of the Soviet conventional and nuclear arms build up a reduction of U.S. armed forces in Europe without a substantial reduction of these forces as part of the disarmament process would seriously jeopardize the 40-year-old peace in our region, Wimmer said.

Wimmer welcomed the fact that the United States will again prove its commitment to the security of Western Europe during the maneuvers to be held in the Federal Republic in the coming weeks. A total of 34,000 troops of the III U.S. Corps from Fort Hood will be crossing the Atlantic by sea and air to take part in the "Reforger 1987" exercise.

FRG POLITICIANS SHOW 'NO UNANIMITY' ON PERSHING ISSUE

LD141011 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 14 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 14 TASS -- By TASS commentator Lev Aksenov:

Albeit the West German Bundestag is now having its recess, political life in Bonn can be described as extremely intensive: in the centre of public attention are the Bundeswehr Pershing-1A missiles and the nuclear warheads to them, which are under the control of the United States.

Now that the most promising area in the Soviet-American Geneva talks is that of medium-range and shorter-range missiles, the Pershing-1A missiles in possession of the FRG have become the main obstacle in the way towards an agreement. The attempts of the leaders of the USA and the FRG to leave out this problem is broadly condemned both in West Germany and far outside it.

Such a treatment of the question would, in the first place, mean the turning of a possible agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles into a sham, and second the danger of FRG's drawing into the nuclear powers' club. The Soviet Union, can, naturally, accept neither.

There are ample examples that the ranks of opponents of Washington's and Bonn's dangerous nuclear missile policy are growing. Literally a few hours ago the Green Party floor in Bundestag demanded a break in the parliamentary recess and convocation of an emergency Bundestag session in order to make official Bonn review its attitude to the problem of Pershing-1A missiles. SPD [Socialist Democratic Party of Germany] Chairman Hans-Jochen Vogel addressed a message to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl demanding that the possession of 72 medium-range missiles by the Bundeswehr be immediately renounced. A similar demand has also been put forward by Gerd Muhr, deputy chairman of the Confederation of German Trade Unions of the FRG (DGB).

Characteristically there is no unanimity either among the leaders of the parties belonging to the Bonn government coalition. Thus Uwe Ronneburger, deputy chairman of the FDP [Free Democratic Party] parliamentary floor, demanded on Thursday that the 72 Pershing-1A missiles be counted at the Soviet-American Geneva talks.

The declaration by the West German leaders that the FRG is not going to become a nuclear power as well as the assurances by the American officials that they sincerely have a stake in a global double zero are in need of a practical proof. It is necessary to give an explicit answer to the question who of them is in fact responsible for this remaining obstacle and what they intend to do so that an agreement become possible?

IZVESTIYA REPORTS BRIEFING ON RADIATION FROM BLAST

PM181225 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Guk report under the rubric "At the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center": "'Selective' Radioactivity; Once More Concerning the Consequences of the Underground Nuclear Explosion on Novaya Zemlya"]

[Text] This is the background to issue: The USSR conducted an underground nuclear explosion on the Novaya Zemlya Island 2 August. An insignificant rise in the level of radioactivity in the atmosphere was observed 9 days later in Sweden and other Scandinavian countries. The Western media immediately raised a hue and cry: Moscow, they say, is threatening the health of millions of people.

A briefing on Monday at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center was devoted to this event. Yu.A. Izrael, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control; G.I. Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration; and B.G. Mayorskiy, deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry department on questions of the peaceful use of nuclear energy and space, briefed journalists in detail on how the situation developed in the aforementioned region after the underground explosion.

In the West it has long been the tradition to assert that radioactive winds blow only from the east. In this particular instance no one, for example, has said a word about the fact that 10 August there was an accident at a nuclear power station in Britain -- a day before the insignificant rise in radioactivity in Sweden was noticed. They pretended that it has not taken place.

After the underground test 2 August, Yu.A. Izrael said, a negligible amount of gas did indeed rise to the surface. This did not occur because of "omissions" or "negligence": Such phenomena occur in any underground explosion, whether in the USSR or the United States. However thick the earth's crust, it is impossible to create a 100-percent hermetic seal. And this amount is negligible because it did not lead to radioactive fallout.

There is in the USSR a system of strict monitoring [kontrol] of the environment after underground nuclear tests are conducted. This was also conducted on this occasion. From 2 through 7 August a special aircraft patrolled the Soviet borders with Scandinavia and did not observe the slightest rise in radioactivity.

One more fact: The level of radioactivity in Sweden produced by natural radon background varies between 1-2 becquerels, and on 11 August this level rose by one-thousandth of a becquerel. Scandinavian scientists themselves think this is not worth mentioning. An insignificant quantity of radioactive products can be detected in any part of the world today.

The USSR, G.I. Gerasimov stressed, as before is ready to stop all nuclear explosions not only to "slam on the brakes" of the nuclear arms race but also to make the natural environment in which we live safe. The United States, which does not even want to hear of this, today more than anybody is whipping up passions and speculating on people's natural misgivings for their health.

At the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, B.G. Mayorskiy added, we placed on the negotiating table proposals to set up a system of global verification using space means (not only of underground tests but also the degree of contamination of water, the atmosphere, and the soil). The United States again opposed this...

IZVESTIYA's question to Yu.A. Izrael:

Was any rise in radioactivity observed in the atmosphere of the USSR's northern regions?

Reply: With the exception of Novaya Zemlya, no, it was not registered anywhere. I state this with the utmost responsibility: Our monitoring [kontrol] is very strict.

So, some radioactivity is selective: the area just east of and just west of the Soviet borders...

NAZARKIN VIEWS CHEMICAL ARMS VERIFICATION

PM181516 Paris LE FIGARO in French 17 Aug 87 p 5

[Interview with Yuriy Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva conference, by Pierre Bocev in Paris -- date not given]

[Text] [Bocev] What is the essence of the USSR's new proposals?

[Nazarkin] We base our proposals on the principle of the need for compulsory inspections on demand without any possibility of refusing. This is the key question because it is linked with the solution of all the other problems. If suspicion exists, any state that has signed the future convention banning chemical weapons must be able to demand an on-site inspection without the suspected state having any right to refuse this inspection.

But this raises a major problem: how to avoid revealing military secrets that have no immediate connection with chemical weapons during such an inspection. Just imagine, to take an extreme example, that we suspected the United States of stocking chemical weapons in the National Security Council building in Washington: If we demanded an on-site inspection inside the building, we would learn secrets that have nothing to do with the real object of our demand. Hence our proposal for "alternative measures": external visual observation, taking samples from the surrounding area, and, if this does not suffice, an inspection inside the building nonetheless, and this is what the Americans call "managed conduct." In short, the establishment of a real code of conduct under the auspices of a technical secretariat which would operate like the IAEA in Vienna. There should be no more than 48 hours between the demand for an inspection and the start of verification, on the understanding that the state that demanded the inspection ought to compensate for any material damage, such as the revelation of trade secrets.

We are prepared to discuss all of this, but the really important thing is the inability to refuse an inspection if suspicion exists.

[Bocev] Just 1 year ago, the USSR did not even admit that it had chemical weapons. It is now making proposals, some of which go further than the Western countries would like.

[Nazarkin] This is practical evidence of the policy of "glasnost" pursued by Mikhail Gorbachev. You can see it yourself.

[Bocev] So, what is the size of the USSR's stocks of chemical weapons? Western estimates range from 200,000 tonnes to 700,000 tonnes.

[Nazarkin] What are the figures for the Americans? There are no official figures. I have not seen any figures for the Soviet Union. I do not know how big the USSR's stocks are. In any case, I cannot comment on these figures.

GERASIMOV HOLDS MINISTRY PRESS BRIEFING 18 AUG

Denies U.S. Campaign Interference

LD181315 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said today that the Soviet Union has not been interfering in the U.S. presidential election campaign and not been voicing any official preferences.

Speaking at a briefing, Gerasimov, chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, categorically denied claims made by the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT magazine in its latest issue to the effect that Mikhail Gorbachev has told a recent visitor that George Bush will be the winner at the next presidential election and will take Robert Dole as his vice-presidential running mate, while Democrats don't stand a chance.

"There has not been, and couldn't have been, such a conversation," Gerasimov said.

"It is Americans themselves that have to decide who their next president will be. The USSR will recognize the American voters' choice even if, as our commentators sometimes point out, it is the choice of a minority, as many Americans do not go to the polls at all and the Presidency of the U.S. goes to a candidate supported by far less than half of the eligible voters."

"Nonetheless, the Soviet Union treats with due respect he who lives at the White House at the given moment," Gerasimov said.

Eyes Hayden's Pacific Peace Plans

LD181525 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- "Addressing the symposium in Canberra on the issue of security and arms control in the northern part of the Pacific, Australia's Minister for Foreign Affairs William Hayden proposed a number of measures to lessen the risk of war in the region. Most of them are, in essence, consonant with the ideas of strengthening military security in that region, which were put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in an interview with the newspaper MERDEKA," Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today.

He said that the Australian minister for foreign affairs had named, in particular, such measures as a limitation, reduction and scrapping of strategic offensive weapons or nuclear weapons of a lesser range deployed in that region, limitations on the number and tonnage of warships, various versions of mutual separation for a safe distance from one another of the navies of the opposite sides and the creation of a nuclear-free zone.

The minister said that there are various ways to implement the ideas spelled out by him. But the first and most sensible step would be the holding of a direct dialogue between the two super-powers on the strategic appraisals of prospects for ensuring security in the northern Pacific.

"Moscow has treated with attention the stand set forth by William Hayden, since we proceed from the premise," Gennadiy Gerasimov stressed, "that the question of ensuring real security, lessening the levels of military confrontation and building up confidence in any region of the world concerns not only the USSR and the USA. There are tens of states in the Pacific region, which can and must make their contribution to that cause. [quotation marks as received]

ADAMISHIN DISCUSSES RIGHTS AT 18 AUG BRIEFING

Views Proposed Conference

LD181718 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Address by Deputy Foreign Minister Adamishin at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists, held at the Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow on 18 August -- recorded]

[Text] The Soviet Union's proposal to convene a representative humanitarian forum in Moscow reflects the general mood for changes, for restructuring, and the extensive process of renovation, which has gripped various aspects of Soviet society. Of course, it could not fail also to touch on foreign policy aspects of the activities of the Soviet state, including the important and, one could say, increasingly significant field of international humanitarian cooperation.

What is it that we would like to achieve in this sphere? What would we like to change? To put it simply, we would like to move from confrontation toward businesslike cooperation. After all, how do things stand now after numerous international forums discussing human rights? They were to all appearances created for cooperation, but in fact they are to a large extent turned into arenas for verbal crossfire, for accusations and counteraccusations, and for propagandistic expatiation. Of course, we could continue to castigate each other, but we reckon that it is better to cooperate. It is not by chance that the 27th CPSU Congress gave a prominent place to humanitarian problems in the overall system of comprehensive international security, which the Soviet Union proposes be created. Nor is it by chance that our concept of the new international relations is briefly summed up by the words: nonnuclear and nonviolent world. The issue of ridding the world of nuclear weapons and reducing weaponry in general is on an equal footing with the issue of humanizing international relations and creating a world that would be free of violence.

What could the conference we propose discuss? It could discuss various problems but discuss them with a view to achieving a practical result, a practical decision. And what might the idea of these practical decisions be? It would be for general cooperation in the humanitarian sphere, for strengthening of mutual understanding and trust, and mainly, the attempt to achieve a real improvement in the state of affairs with human rights everywhere, in all the countries participating in the CSCE, and moreover, comprehensively civil, political, economic, social and other rights and liberties. Why comprehensively? Because that is how the Final Act of the all-European conference calls for them to be considered.

During the 9 months since our foreign minister, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, submitted this proposal at the Vienna meeting, the Soviet Union has considered a whole series of considerations and wishes expressed by representatives of Western countries. The Soviet Union is proposing something in which it is itself sincerely interested, and the fact that this is not just words is demonstrated by the fact that we are beginning in our country. We are convinced that a whole series of problems with human rights have been resolved by us better than in the West. Social protection is higher in our country. People's confidence in tomorrow is greater. However, we have never considered that we have reached the limit, and a sideways glance at our affairs may prove useful.

Look at what has been done in something like a couple of years, from the broadening of the rights of labor collectives, the opportunities for people to influence production and social life, to the perfection of legislation, the adoption of a whole series of new laws that protect the legitimate rights of citizens, including the law on appealing against the actions of officials; from change to the practice of departures from the USSR, contacts between people, to the rapid blossoming of spiritual and creative life.

So, let our Western partners decide more quickly that the transfer in human rights from confrontation to cooperation meets universal interests -- and that means their own interests -- and meets the demands of the times.

Comments on Soviet Psychiatry

LD181827 Moscow TASS in English 1459 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- Answering newsmen's questions at a press conference on humanitarian problems today, Anatoliy Adamishin, a deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, said that psychiatry had never been used and was not being used in the Soviet Union for political purposes.

This does not mean that Soviet psychiatry has no problems, he went on to say. A recent decision to reorganize thoroughly the Soviet health care system demonstrates that problems do exist and that there is room for improvement.

The legal aspect of that delicate matter is being upgraded, including such concrete issues as control over examination and treatment, the right of appeal in cases when it seems that the findings of psychiatrists are not lawful. Moreover, it is planned to introduce criminal liability for the abuse of psychiatry.

Anatoliy Adamishin said that he had invited Richard Schifter, U.S. assistant secretary of state for human rights and humanitarian affairs, to come to Moscow to attend the conference on humanitarian cooperation. He will be able to visit any Soviet psychiatric clinic and make his own conclusion about the status of psychiatry in the Soviet Union.

The deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR told newsmen about an incident which had occurred in Leningrad not so long ago. Militia detained a man thought to be a mental patient near the building of the West German Consulate General. After the detention the man was hospitalized in a psychiatric clinic. However, when West German consular officials learnt that the man's name was Mayer, they protested over the fact that a German was barred from making contact with his compatriots. However, later two West German consular officials visited the clinic and saw for themselves that the man did not speak German. They also saw for themselves that he was indeed seriously ill. After that the interest of the West German officials to Mayer instantly disappeared.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD162055 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 16 Aug 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; TASS Political Observer Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev; and MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI Observer Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades. The past week has brought us no tangible signs of any easing tension in the world, above all in the regions we call hot spots. On the contrary, the situation in the Persian Gulf in particular -- as you can see from the daily reports on radio and television and from the papers -- is getting steadily worse, mainly because of the increasing number of warships of foreign states and all area countries in that comparatively small stretch of water.

I call it a small stretch of water because there are already concentrated in its area of just over 100,000 square kilometers, or on their way there, 252 vessels, not counting, of course, the aircraft they carry. It's this proportion that gives one the impression that all these naval ships -- and there are tankers as well, of course -- are actually almost within sight of each other, to say nothing of the fact that they can detect each other on their radar screens.

In short, there are excessive forces built up there, nerves are overstrained, and all these mines that have been laid along the coasts hold such danger that the probability of an armed conflict cannot be ruled out. Both political and military logic suggests that the only way to remove that probability is to remove from the area these weapons for the destruction of human lives. Observers -- notably the commentators of the U.S. television and radio corporation ABC -- have been correct in taking the view that, however careful we are, a conflict could in fact happen purely by accident. That evaluation has been made in the White House since the Reagan administration, hypnotized as it is by the notion of military superiority as a way of resolving the conflict, clearly has no intention of withdrawing its warships.

[Tsoppi] There is a further point I'd like to draw attention to. Today, this whipping up of tension -- military tension -- in this region, in the Persian Gulf, is already becoming an international matter. It's a sad observation to have to make, but today, this tension is being whipped up and the threat of a military conflict, a military explosion in the region is being intensified, not just by the United States, but also by Britain and France. These countries constitute three of the five members of the Security Council who voted for the resolution calling for the cessation of all military operations in the area.

As you'll remember, the Soviet Union and the PRC also voted for that resolution, and naturally we're doing nothing to increase this military threat in any way. Under obvious pressure from Washington, dissociate themselves from it as they will -- and the pressure began as long ago as the June summit in Venice -- Britain and France today share in some degree -- with the United States -- the responsibility for what is happening in the Gulf. Britain, and an hour later, France -- coincidentally according to Paris, but actually by agreement, and by agreement with Washington -- announced that they were sending naval vessels to the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Oman to act as minesweepers.

The claim was that the FRG had nothing to do with these missiles since they belonged exclusively to the United States. At once -- literally -- answering voices rang out from across the Atlantic. Among them was the voice of the leader of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, Max Kampelman, who said, literally: We can only speak for ourselves. We are not negotiating for West Germany. I fully understand the German position, and if we deprived them of these warheads, we'd be violating our relationship with our allies and giving them a slap in the face. Well, really, this whole whirl is transparent and obvious: on the one hand, they've found an obviously artificial impediment to the negotiations, an attempt to force the Soviet Union to make yet another concession on the other hand, as far as the FRG itself is concerned, it seems to me that official Bonn is clinging to these 72 missiles for the reason, to some extent, that the ruling coalition wants to pay tribute to its right wing, to the forces known in the FRG as the steel helmets, because the progress of the Soviet-U.S. talks along the path of disarmament, and, in general, the opening of a path toward a new realistic and creative mode of thought in international politics, all this is arousing great displeasure among the reactionary forces in the FRG, and all means are fair, aa they say.

[Tsoppi] But don't you think it also signifies a desire on the part of the forces you've been talking about to get their hands on nuclear weapons, which in principle, West Germany is banned from possessing?

[Grigoryev] The official word from Bonn is that: We are not a nuclear power, we don't want these nuclear weapons, and we do not formally possess them.

[Charikov] Yes, but they have a bit of an inferiority complex. They do like to...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] They do feel something of the sort. Incidentally, to return to the sending of ships to the Persian Gulf, though the FRG has, thank God, had the sense not to send ships, some people there have been in favor of doing so, of taking part in this colonial war. So, naturally, there are very powerful forces in the FRG that would like to have these missiles on their own territory.

[Tsoppi] It was not for nothing that Comrade Shevardnadze asked the question: How and by what right does this third country -- that is, the Federal Republic of Germany -- possess nuclear weapons? As far as we are aware, it has neither the legal nor the moral right to do so.

[Charikov] Certainly not. And that fact is being pointed out by no less considerable political forces in the FRG itself: Above all, the main opposition force, the Social Democrats, who...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] The Greens have demanded that they should interrupt the recess and hold...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Yes, hold a special debate in the Bundestag. A great many democratic organizations, including the press, are urging that the FRG should not obstruct the way. In the coalition, too, there are forces. I liked what a good friend of mine, Herbert (Straten) wrote. He's the editor -- foreign editor -- of NEUE RUHRZEITUNG. He's often been to Moscow and keeps a close watch on our affairs. Anyway, he wrote that Bonn should not be preening itself with the nuclear feathers of the U.S. eagle. That's both well said and, actually...

[Tsoppi, interrupting] Yes, it's a very vivid phrase.

[Charikov] I'd like to continue your train of thought, Aleksey Nikolayevich, and quote another member of the Social Democratic Party of the FRG, the deputy chairman of the party's faction in the Bundestag, Horst Ehmke. He contributed an article -- or rather, an extended political essay -- to the U.S. WORLD POLICY JOURNAL. Here's what he writes: Instead of enthusiastically welcoming the Soviet Union's acceptance of NATO's own zero proposal, the NATO functionaries have reacted to it with caution and even suspicion, bringing out one reservation after another and ultimately stipulating a new condition, concerning the retention of the 72 Pershing-A [as heard] missiles in the FRG. They've even claimed that Gorbachev's assent to the double-zero option was another Soviet trick, with the object of turning Europe into a nuclear-free zone, detaching it from the United States, and splitting the alliance. As soon as it became clear that there was a possibility of concluding an agreement on medium-range [promezhutochnoy dalnosti] nuclear forces, official circles in the Western alliance -- meaning NATO -- began to talk about compensatory measures: deploying sea-based cruise missiles, increasing the number of aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons, and so on and so forth.

[Tsoppi] You know, all the same, I think in our time, which is a time not only of new thinking but also of new mutual trust, we've had enough of seeking the enemy, finding the enemy, exposing the enemy and trying to win the enemy over to our point of view. I think we're all bound together by the same fate on this planet, and our present philosophy in foreign policy is based on precisely that premise because we are quite openly proposing that nothing should be left that could get out of the control of the state possessing it, nothing, whether it be space, or nuclear weapons, or nuclear explosions, or chemical weapons. We invite scientists and inspectors, we invite them not only to our nuclear explosions, which we are today forced to carry out because our moratorium met with no response in the form of a reciprocal moratorium by the United States. We even invite them to come to the area where we have a Soviet military installation concerned with chemical weapons so they can see what we're producing and then come to the site near Chapayevsk where we are now building a works for the destruction of chemical weapons, to see that for themselves as well. We consider it obligatory that inspectors from other countries should be present at all launchings of intercontinental space projectiles [snaryady]. In other words, we're leaving not a single loophole, either for ourselves or for the others, when it comes to establishing total trust on the path of disarmament. It's worth noticing, I think, that this also represents an evolution of our own views: It's a big change in our own attitude to the problem of verification [kontrol], which is actually what the reminder...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Since we are talking about restructuring, talking about the new thinking in international affairs...

[Charikov, interrupting] It must find expression in some changes of attitude on our own part, in our own approaches...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Of course.

[Tsoppi] We are not just appealing to the others for probity and honesty. We are saying: Our doors are open to you. You are welcome -- come and verify! If there is something you do not believe, check it. But they are drawing up -- this is something the President of the United States is still very good at -- drawing up some sort of antithesis, drawing up, well, making new attempts to engender new suspicions about the Soviet Union.

[Charikov] Well, if we are speaking about trust, then I would just like to say a couple of words. Indeed, there is virtually no shortage of signs of trust at the moment. This is being admitted by top U.S. politicians. Such phrases are being spoken from time to time, and they cannot help being said because our steps to strengthen trust are so obvious and so, if I may put it this way, impact-making, that it is impossible to simply not talk about them or not take them into consideration.

[Tsoppi] Nevertheless, Reagan is always trying to spoil his reputation. In this television address that you spoke about, Igor Pavlovich, he said the following, despite all his fine words: The Soviets are having talks with us because we are conducting these talks from a position of strength. In other words, the same old approach again. Yes, that is a typical feature of U.S. foreign policy that may be traced back over decades. They believe that it is only by force that a partner can be induced to speak about serious things.

[Grigoryev] Well, if we have started to speak about recent speeches by the President -- there were several of them in a row, we noticed -- then one cannot really fail to draw attention to the fact that, by acknowledging the need for talks on disarmament and saying that these talks were generally proceeding successfully, the President could not resist making all kinds of attacks on the Soviet Union, socialism, and communism in general. Regarding the current anniversary of the building of the defensive fortifications on the GDR-West Berlin border, he came down once again against what is called the wall, demanding for the umpteenth time that it be destroyed and that all the people who are supposedly prisoners be released, so to speak.

[Charikov] Aleksey N[illegible]olayevich, it is probably worth reminding our listeners of the history of how this so-called wall came to be built.

[Grigoryev] These structures that separate the GDR from West Berlin were put up in 1961, in the middle of August to be exact, and they were put up -- one can see from these dates -- a long time after the creation of the GDR: They were put up simply by force of necessity. First, one must remember, above all, that every sovereign state has its own state borders. Since it happened that in the center of the GDR there was a sort of foreign body with which it has a state border -- an entity with a capitalist way of life, to say nothing of the fact that quite a few organizations of one kind or another existed and still exist in this city that in no way have contributed toward either the economic successes of the GDR or its political strengthening, but, on the contrary, quite the opposite -- then the GDR was compelled to put up these fortifications. In other words, the GDR acted to make itself secure against all kinds of intrigues from across the street as they say.

Well, one should also remember the GDR was created and has been strengthened in conditions of a constant, absolutely frenzied struggle against it with the aid of all means apart from military ones -- although we recall there was an attempt at that in 1963, on the part of the FRG, which operated via West Berlin with the support of the United States. The GDR was slandered, they tried to undermine the GDR economically, the GDR was humiliated, and so on. It is perfectly natural that the socialist German state, dealing, so to speak, a rebuff to these things, finally adopted a decision to put up a fortified state border. Yet to denounce the GDR, as it were, for creating this frontier is the same as being indignant about customs buildings and border guards, which exist in all states. So this argument doesn't stand up as they say.

But regarding this, I would like to draw attention to the following: Of late, and from the U.S. President as well, these attacks against the GDR have become more frequent. One may recall that in June, when he was in West Berlin, he again made such statements.

[Charikov] Aleksey Nikolayevich, just a moment. In my opinion it has already become a tradition among U.S. Presidents to go to West Berlin and alongside the wall, alongside these defensive buildings, to make instigatory speeches.

[Tsoppi] Not just U.S. Presidents...

[Cherikov, interrupting] Well, mainly we are talking about U.S. Presidents. Yes, the first example is Kennedy.

[Tsoppi] It was Francois Mitterrand who made the first...

[Grigoryev, interrupting] Mitterrand and Thatcher were both there; all these things are generally well known, and, unfortunately, they do exist. But this is what I wanted to say. Despite these attacks, despite other kinds of warfare, propagandist and other, still, despite the complexities in this connection in the relations of the two German states, I relate this to the fact that shoots of a healthy new thinking are nonetheless visible in international affairs. Despite all kinds of slumps and deviations, these shoots are nevertheless there. Progress is being made, and it seems to me that one of the signs of this specific situation in the relations between the two German states -- the socialist and capitalist -- is the upcoming state visit by GDR leader Erich Honecker to the FRG, which was at one time postponed because of all kinds of provocations, and will now take place at the beginning of September. This is undoubtedly an important factor in the further consolidation and stabilization in the center of Europe.

The leaders of the two German states have stated more than once that war must never again emanate from German soil. This is very important. We know how much our friends in the GDR are doing in this direction, and we know that there are forces in the FRG who also favor this. But we also know that there are other forces, too, who are doing quite a bit to ensure that these words remain just words and are not translated into deeds. It seems to me that Comrade Honecker's visit to the FRG will strengthen people's confidence that both German states will contribute to ensure that such a war never happen again.

[Tsoppi] Nevertheless, Aleksey Nikolayevich, I think that two conclusions may be drawn from your analysis of the present relations between the two German states. First, that dialogue and mutual understanding are possible despite all the differences in ideology, culture, history, approaches, and membership to different political and military blocs. All this is possible. On the other hand, there is an evident desire on the part of the reactionary forces both in West Germany and in the United States -- if you want to put it in their words -- to erect a new wall of mistrust in Europe. I think that when Reagan was saying that the Soviet Union should prove in practice its glasnost, which he translates as openness [otkrytost], by taking down the wall, he was again partitioning off the Europeans. He was again sowing mistrust in the policy -- now the united foreign policy -- of the socialist states and the new military doctrine recently adopted by all the states of the Warsaw Pact, a doctrine to which up to now we have received no sensible response from the Atlantic alliance.

In other words, those very people who sigh that it was Yalta that divided Europe, that this was terrible, this Europe, this scar in the middle of Europe, this division, these same people are still trying to increase the remoteness of various parts of Europe, to increase their mutual lack of understanding and their prejudices against each other. One must have a very serious attitude to this. In this regard one really must remember that we favor real openness in relations between states and peoples, and we are finding more and more supporters in Europe and elsewhere.

[Grigoryev] This is the main thing: We are finding more and more support, despite the fact that periodically political somersaults such as these are performed in speeches and actions are taken in an attempt to put a brake on the positive process that is taking place in Europe and throughout the world.

[Charikov] Well, comrades, on that positive note I would like to wind up our program today. I thank you on behalf of those taking part in it, and say good-bye.

'STUDIO 9' PANEL DISCUSSES HELSINKI FINAL ACT

OW151017 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0556 GMT 15 Aug 87

["Studio 9" program moderated by professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Anatoliy Gavrilovich Kovalev, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Andrey Serafimovich Grachev, section chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We meet at Studio 9 at the Ostankino Television Center for a scheduled talk devoted to topical problems of world politics. Today our guests in Studio 9 are Anatoliy Gavrilovich Kovalev, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, and Andrey Serafimovich Grachev, section chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department.

Recently, much of the material carried in the political press and in speeches by state figures of various countries has been dedicated to the 12th anniversary of the signing of the Helsinki documents and the end of the Helsinki talks -- much has been said and written about this as well as actively commented on -- an event that has been compared with the most important and significant congresses and conferences in the history of foreign relations.

I would like to begin today's talk with a question: When we speak of Helsinki, about the Helsinki Act, about the Helsinki process, what do we mean? A peculiar homage to tradition? Love for anniversaries? Or is it a realistic appraisal of circumstances as they formed? Is the Helsinki Act an archival document or is it a document which is in force today and exerts an influence on the development of the political process? At the same time I would like to ask you, Antoliy Gavrilovich, how is the Helsinki process viewed today?

[Kovalev] I think the Helsinki Final Act is archival only in that the original is being kept in an archive in Finland. In spirit, this document is in force, it is working, it is working today, and is working for the future.

To answer your second question as to how the Helsinki Final Act and the European process as a whole are perceived today, I feel the Helsinki Final Act, indeed the Helsinki and the overall European process, are in harmony with the restructuring of international relations and the restructuring processes taking place in our country.

The reverse also applies: Our domestic restructuring fills the Helsinki process with vital fluids.

[Zorin] Well, I think this could be considered an example of the close interdependence about which Vladimir Ilich spoke of between domestic and foreign policies that cannot be separated.

[Kovalev] This is quite correct. Today this relationship between domestic and foreign policies is even stronger, between the tasks set by our party and society in the renewal of all spheres of life and between those tasks assigned in foreign policy, including the determination of solutions and the search for new and fresh approaches to the solution of piled-up problems.

[Grachev] Valentin Sergeyevich, if you will allow me to return to your question on whether the Final Act is not in fact dated. Quite naturally, before this program I reread it, and when I was doing this I became aware of a peculiar feeling that the further we get from the time the document was signed, the closer we actually get to it. This is because many of us, I think, are enjoying reading works previously not published or not republished and are surprised at how topical these works are, as though they were written only yesterday. Likewise, when one is reading the Helsinki Act, at least that is the case for me, I get the urge to say that maybe this document was written tomorrow since the Europe that it describes and the path this document is paving is not, unfortunately, the Europe of today. It is sooner the Europe of tomorrow, although the document is very specific, diplomatic and is not, in any way, utopian. But there can be no question that it remains pertinent to this day.

[Kovalev] Pardon me, Andrey Serafimovich. I would like to add something. I agree that large objects are better seen from a distance, but I would like to add another point. In past years the Helsinki Act, in all its aspects, was not fully acted upon. Much remained hidden like sections of the Helsinki Act dealing with economic, scientific and technical cooperation, environmental and humanitarian problems. The full potential of the Helsinki Act was not fully utilized, and these tasks remain to be solved tomorrow and the day after tomorrow.

[Zorin] I am very pleased that you are talking about this because when I was thinking about a program on this topic some of my colleagues said this was old hat. And this is not the case at all. So, regarding what you have been saying, Anatoliy Gavrilovich, I wish to ask the following: You said that not everything was acted upon. Is it because the document was before its time?

[Kovalev] I think there are several reasons for this. Perhaps, to some extent, this document was before its time in some aspects. In other aspects, if we are discussing the foundation of the common European house, it put an end to the past, that is the inviolability of postwar borders in Europe. Also, I think there were subjective reasons and reasons connected with the general development of the international situation, given there was a noticeable decline in the policies of detente for well-known reasons, as well as instances of sharp conflict, and under these conditions the Helsinki Act and the general European process could not achieve their full potentials.

[Zorin] But its potential proved sufficient to make its usefulness apparent so many years later.

[Kovalev] Yes, I think this is the case.

[Zorin] I understand that when we are speaking about a document as serious as this, which is multilateral and includes as many aspects as the Helsinki Act does, it would be possible to discuss it at great length. I repeat: The document is complex. Therefore, I would like to ask you -- it could be a subjective opinion or it may well be the case -- what is, in your opinion, the most important point of the Helsinki Act?

[Kovalev] If I were to attempt to answer your question very briefly, I would answer it in one word: Viability. This is related to your next question.

[Grachev] Valentin Sergeyevich, you never asked me this question.

[Zorin] I have not had the time.

[Grachev] I would have characterized the Helsinki Final Act as an example of or a precursor of the new thinking in matters of foreign policy because it was worked out and accepted -- and this makes it more valuable -- during the far from easy period about which Anatoliy Gavrilovich just spoke. There are a number of reasons why this document could be attributed to the flashes of new thinking, which at that time were few and far between. To summarize, in my opinion, the following could be said about its character: Perhaps in this document, more clearly than in any previous document, the universal nature of acute international problems touching, in this case, the various European states irrespective of the social system they belong to, became apparent.

Second, the global aspect of these same problems. We are speaking about Europe, which is of some importance to the rest of the world and likewise, the rest of the world is not indifferent to Europe. Finally, the third point which is, in my opinion, extremely important: This document contains the most, in my opinion, complete approach forwarded in the seventies to the problem of security, which encompasses political, military, economic, and humanitarian matters. I think that in terms of the sum of all these factors, this document could indeed be seen as a milestone.

[Zorin] Thus, we are discussing something that is of great concern to us and has a direct relationship to the conditions under which we live. Therefore, Anatoliy Gavrilovich, I would like to go back to your answer, to viability. It is a very broad word and has many shades of meaning. Because the meaning of the word is so broad, I would like for you to be a bit more specific and provide some examples.

[Kovalev] Regarding this, I think I will emphasize two points. First regarding the reply Andrey Serafimovich has just given, and then I will cite a corresponding illustration. In fact, when you named the components of the Final Act -- the military, political, economic, ecological, and humanitarian spheres -- it is possible from today's position to say that this was already a tangible example of new thinking and new political psychology.

To some extent it was the prototype of a system of universal international security that is being proposed today by the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and which is being received not only in Europe but throughout the world as well with great understanding, particularly in the developing countries and the United Nations. This is one aspect of the answer to the question of its viability.

The second can be illustrated by the fact that the European process has its genealogical tree, if I can put it this way, a solid tree [drevo] if we want to be bombastic. I would like to illustrate this with a diagram that I have here. Besides, perhaps not everyone recalls the stages that the European process went through and what components and parts form this process. [Video shows a chart with the words "European process" at the bottom; branching lines lead to a vertical stack of boxes with names and dates of various conferences noted; camera dwells on a box headed "Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe" noting its three stages]. So I will use this diagram depicting this European process.

It began with consultations in Helsinki as far back as November 1972. Rules, procedures, and tasks for the future were worked out. This was followed by the first stage in Helsinki at the foreign minister level in July 1973, then the second stage in Geneva from September 1973 to July 1975, and finally there was the third stage held at the summit level.

Now I would like to dwell in somewhat greater detail on the Geneva stage. It was a stage of preparatory diplomatic work during which the text of the Final Act was coordinated, and it was agreed on and worked out down to the last comma during this stage.

[Zorin] Anatoliy Gavrilovich, may I interrupt you to digress somewhat? I do not want to interrupt the logic of your thoughts, but I would like to ask a few questions to digress a little. The fact is that presently we are all interested in history -- Helsinki is already history because time really flies -- and it so happens that you were one of those Soviet diplomats who had the most direct relationship to what you have called the Geneva preparatory stage. I recall that during that project we journalists had many questions, beginning with the question -- roughly or frankly speaking -- why are they puttering around for so long? Why is it taking so long? [laughs]

[Kovalev] Valentin Sergeyevich, excuse me, I will interrupt. What measures can we use to define long? Take the talks on reducing conventional arms in central Europe. They have been going for more than 13 years and so far there have been no practical results, and judging by everything we can hardly expect any. The Geneva stage where the Final Act was agreed upon -- I can cite exact figures -- continued for 22 months and 3 days, not counting the nights. The Madrid meeting lasted almost exactly 3 years. So I...

[Zorin interrupts] I give in, you have convinced me.

[Kovalev] Possibly now there is a need for acceleration, but for that time...

[Zorin interrupts] It was very fast.

[Kovalev] You could say it was a normal pace, more or less.

[Zorin] There is another question I would like to ask you as a person who took a direct, and I would say, working part in this historic event. Where did you experience the greatest difficulties as head of the Soviet delegation during the preparatory stage in Geneva?

[Kovalev] There were many difficulties, very many. First, everything was being done for the first time. The European process was just emerging. Second, this process was taking place at the initiative of the socialist countries and the Soviet Union. There was a feeling of rejection and repulsion among a number of Western countries; it was difficult to persuade them to take part in the European process itself and in preparing for a summit meeting and the elaboration of the Final Act. Third, I have said that this was a new process. It was also new in another sense. The Final Act document was written by 35 pens, 35 European states as well as the United States and Canada. And this was on the basis of a consensus rule. In other words, if any one of the participants was in disagreement there could be no formula or formulation. This...

[Grachev interrupts] In other words, this was the most democratic way imaginable.

[Kovalev] I think...

[Zorin interrupts] The most difficult, I could add.

[Kovalev] I think this is a very democratic principle and is one of the ways democracy is applied in diplomacy that permits every state to contribute a bit of its national experience to take part in the process of joint creation.

[Zorin] But, Anatoliy Gavrilovich, a consensus in diplomacy makes the negotiations process very complicated.

[Kovalev] Undoubtedly. One has to convince even an isolated state that has some kind of reservations and to change its mind, to convince it to arrive at a common denominator and find a balance of interests of all 35 participants.

[Grachev] May I ask a question, Valentin Sergeyevich?

[Zorin] Go ahead, please.

[Grachev] I am infringing on your rights as the moderator, but I want to take this opportunity to interview one of the editors of the Final Act. Anatoliy Gavrilovich, if you had the opportunity today, not you alone but together with your colleagues, to rewrite or, say, attempt to conclude this Final Act anew, would you change much in it?

[Kovalev] I think the Final Act was compiled under specific historic circumstances and history is not rewritten. Documents that are a product of history, including diplomatic ones, are not subject to rewriting. Regarding the topic we are discussing, I would like to stress and express a certain feeling of goodwill towards all those partners that participated in the work of compiling the Final Act. They included enemies, opponents, and disputes. Acute confrontations occurred. But in the long run I would like to recognize all of them, heads of delegations, members of delegations, experts, and translators -- all who participated in this process that we call creation -- and as a participant to personally give them, all the representatives of the 35 countries, their due.

[Zorin] Anatoliy Gavrilovich, another and final question along these lines. It is even somewhat personal, but when your preparatory work at the Geneva stage was drawing to an end, Soviet television sent me to Geneva to interview you so that you could tell our television viewers what is occurring and what had occurred. You gave an extensive interview. Maybe some of our television viewers recall it. But I would like to ask you: I understand that at that time there were some questions that you could not speak about, being a diplomat. Now several years have passed. Are there some matters that you could reveal now during this meeting with our television viewers?

[Kovalev] Valentin Sergeyevich, I hope that after 12 years, if you ran the film of that interview, you would not chide me for saying something that had not occurred at the time or about how the course of the talks developed later. But of course at that time I had hints about the position we might take in the near future, but there was no opportunity at the time to reveal everything fully. But I spoke only the truth during that interview.

Now to conclude the topic -- I think we have been dealing with the Geneva stage too long because it is linked with various recollections -- I would like to say that the most pleasant moment of this stage was reflected in two dispatches that I took today from the Foreign Ministry archive. If you permit...

[Zorin interrupts] Yes, this is very interesting.

[Kovalev] They are quite brief, and I will read them.

[Zorin] Please.

[Kovalev] Here is one of them. It is dated 19 July 1975. Late on the night of 18-19 July, the coordinating committee of the second stage of the CSCE agreed that the third stage of the summit meeting will begin on 30 July in Helsinki. The dispatch was brief and it indicated that the question on the future development of the Helsinki process and the signing of the Final Act had been decided.

The second dispatch: Today, 21 July, at 0345, the second stage of the CSCE concluded its work under the chairmanship of the USSR. It is dated 21 July. All that was left after this was to publish the text of the Final Act in various languages, which was done in Switzerland, and to have them flown to Helsinki in time for the summit meeting. It was believed that this could be achieved with two airplanes. Just in case, so to speak.

[Zorin] That is, in case one did not make it?

[Kovalev] It was necessary for the cargo to be in Helsinki by 30 July.

[Zorin] Anatoliy Gavrilovich: Due to my curiosity as a historian, I have forced you to digress from the details of the charts we have shown our television viewers. Do forgive me, but let us return to it.

[Kovalev] After the conference in Helsinki, where the Final Act was signed, the Belgrade conference took place. It adopted a decision to hold the next similar European meeting in Madrid.

The Belgrade meeting consisted of several forums that more or less completed their work successfully or otherwise. This was followed by the Madrid meeting, which, as I have already said, continued for nearly 3 years. Here, the paths, so to speak, diverge. As you can see on this genealogical tree, several forums took place and I would like to dwell on two of these. They represent branching-off from the Madrid meeting, which decided to convene them.

First was the meeting in Bern of the experts on contacts between people. There, a document addressing this question was agreed to. Thirty-four participating countries voted in favor. A document was ready to be accepted in a sphere that is very important to people: personal contacts between people. But one country made use of the rule of consensus and agreement on this document was not reached. The country was the United States of America. The USSR, on the other hand, is prepared to implement the Bern document and we urge other states to take bilateral action on this basis. Here then is one forum on the genealogical tree, this chart that I have focused on.

The second was most important and was the Stockholm conference, which became the child of the Madrid meeting. It too was a proposal made by the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. Measures of confidence and security in Europe were discussed there. It ended, as is known, successfully. A whole package of confidence measures in the military sphere was worked out. For the first time in history, on-site verification and inspection was permitted so as to assure that there be no abuse or divergence in carrying out these agreements. Our country too has this right as do our partners. I wish to stress that we, the Soviet nation, and our people are no less interested in this right of inspection and verification than the others.

We remember 1941 and many other things.

Now the Vienna meeting is taking place. Perhaps we will dwell on it in some detail. It is just like the Madrid meeting with 35 participating states. Presently it is in recess, but in mid-September the Vienna meeting will resume its work.

[Zorin] Thank you. I think this is very interesting and makes it more specific because this is often brought up in general terms. But I think those deeply interested in international relations, and among the permanent viewers of Studio 9 they are a majority, would find it interesting to hear from a specialist providing a specific analysis.

Now, Andrey Serafimovich, I would like to pose the following question to you. Years have elapsed since the signing of the Helsinki Act. This was a complex period with its successes and failures. This is how I would like to pose the question to you. What have these years taught us if we were to view that period from today's perspective?

[Grachev] Summarizing the results of the 12-year period, it is appropriate to ask what is the result of the work of the Final Act, since truly it is a document that became operative from the day that it was signed. We see, as Anatoliy Gavrilovich has just detailed the different stages of the development of the Helsinki process, that the European states, including the United States and Canada, have not arrived at the 12th anniversary with empty hands or empty baskets, if we are to use the terminology applicable to the Final Act. Nevertheless, I think that you are correct. The primary results, notwithstanding the practical results that have been achieved, are mutual lessons. Mutual lessons in the art of European detente.

I think this lesson taught us, to a great extent, that both Eastern and Western Europe, during the period in question, should have, to a great extent, rid themselves of serious illusions that could have existed and undoubtedly did exist during that period. I remember the solemn and uplifting atmosphere that existed at the signing ceremony of the Final Act at the Finlandia Palace.

Illusions did exist. The West had them. I think there were many among the statesmen and influential political circles in the West that believed European detente was an instrument of sorts or a skeleton key to change the domestic order in socialist countries. The years have shown that there is no basis for this in the Final Act, European detente or the Helsinki process. It is not surprising that some circles in West European countries and particularly beyond the ocean, have began losing interest in the process and in the term detente itelf. We remember this.

However, there were also aspects of the Helsinki process that I feel we should have reconsidered and rid ourself of some kind of auto-suggestion which I would describe as follows: The illusion that the Helsinki process and European detente were acquiring such self-perpetuating force that in the future they could continue to develop out of sheer momentum; the idea that the West will continue to be our active partner in the continuation of the Helsinki process, in its broadening and deepening -- by this I mean the broadening into other spheres, primarily the sphere of military detente; the illusion that the West will take our word at face value in respect to our good, peaceful intentions irrespective of any of our foreign policy actions, steps, programs -- which include military ones; and finally the illusion concerning the fact that political detente in Europe and the Helsinki process could be moved along at a rate we all were interested in, particularly in the military and political spheres, drawing our attention away from such very important parts of the Helsinki process and the Final Act as humanitarian problems and humanitarian cooperation.

This, in my view, is a summation of those lessons that I think both sides have learned from this period, lessons that after a period of complicated mutual relations in recent years have now led, as I see it, to prerequisites were created, primarily, of course, by the new stage in Soviet foreign policy, the new thinking that characterizes it today. I would say, first of all, that one of the basic characteristics of this policy of our state is elimination of any variance between word and deed. This also goes for domestic policy.

[Zorin] I would like to snatch at a phrase that you used and to ask you to continue your thought. You said that at a certain stage the West, convinced that the third basket in which human rights were deposited ... [turns to Kovalev] Anatoliy Gavrilovich, it was called the third basket during the preparatory stage?

[Kovalev] Yes.

[Zorin] From the very beginning, then. And so, convinced that its calculations were not being justified, the West lost interest in the general process to a known degree. So the question to you, first of all, is why did it occur at all that the problem of human rights turned into a problem in which the West attacked us while we seemed to take the defensive during this period?

How could it happen when, if we eschew propaganda sallies and consider things seriously as serious people ought to do, it is generally not we who should be justifying ourselves but our interlocutors should be justifying themselves in many ways.

The second question to you both: How does this complicated and far from simple problem appear today at the present stage of the Helsinki process?

[Grachev] I think it is right to say that arguments, debates, and conflicts, if you will, around the questions deposited in the third basket, were probably most intense during the stage when this document was being edited and prepared. After all, we are talking about questions that are, first of all, the most ideological in character, and when we talk about mutual relations, especially cooperation between states representing different social systems, it follows that this must give rise to arguments and dissension.

Secondly, particularly sensitive issues have and remain under discussion, I would say, because it is precisely these issues that are to a great extent the ingredients of domestic policy for various states. This leads to additional sensitivity and perceptual acuteness. Finally, if we talk about what particular experience we have acquired today in discussions and cooperation on humanitarian questions relating to the third basket, I think that here we should practically...[changes thought] Well, I would put it as follows: Anatoliy Gavrilovich said that the Helsinki document was signed by 35 pens. But it seems to me that over a certain period of time both Western and Eastern Europe, when discussing the Helsinki document, appeared to be speaking about two different documents.

Even in official documents of the U.S. Administration we can still see references to the Helsinki Act on Human Rights. In other words, from the entire Helsinki process and document only one aspect of it was selected, clearly placing an artificial distance between it and the other components.

It should be said that we too, as I see it, attempted during a certain period to also interpret this Final Act in our own unilateral way, viewing it as a Final Act on the inviolability of borders in Europe, disregarding or underestimating those aspects of humanitarian cooperation that were included in it and hiding to a certain extent behind a screen composed of the principles of noninterference into internal affairs. We considered, as I have said, that questions of military and political detente can be dealt with while leaving by the wayside, progress on the questions of humanitarian cooperation.

And finally, not linking questions of democracy and human rights with military and political aspects of European detente. I think that recently we have had to review many of our positions on all of these questions, and not under Western pressure.

[Zorin] I was taken aback by the words: had to.

[Grachev] We had to. We had to because I think our own lives, which put a whole series of domestic problems before us, forced us to turn and look at these questions in a new way. I think that after the 27th CPSU Congress and particularly after the January CPSU Central Committee plenum, when question of democratization for all areas of public life were set, formulated, and elaborated as essential prerequisites for further progress by all of society, this in fact forced us to look at these questions anew. In this regard, we were cleaning up certain debts to ourselves, not to the West.

[Kovalev] I would add to this that both diplomats and -- begging your pardon -- journalists, experienced a cringing reflex simply at the mention of human rights as if human rights and their implementation are not the main function of socialist society. The turnabout occurred, of course, as a result of our own internal requirements for development of Soviet society after the March and April plenums and as a result of the 27th CPSU Congress and particularly the January Central Committee plenum.

The proposal of the Soviet Union forwarded at the Vienna meeting on convening a conference on humantarian cooperation in Moscow, has become a concrete example of this turnabout. I would like to stress that it was fairly unexpected for the Vienna meeting participants when Comrade Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, made this proposal in his speech in Vienna.

Presently, proposals are submitted in the form of a document at the Vienna meeting. We propose discussion of the entire package of humanitarian cooperation issues and have taken the initiative for the Moscow conference. A point that made a very strong impression among the proposals made at the Vienna meeting was the proposal to hold the conference under a political slogan of open access to the press and public at plenary meetings. This has never occurred in the European process. This is glasnost and democratism in action in international relations and diplomacy.

[Zorin] Anatoliy Gavrilovich: I know that it is easier to ask this question than answer it, nevertheless I would like to ask you: Will our partners agree to this conference? Presently they are obviously set against it.

[Kovalev] Discussions are presently proceeding on these proposals. Some are more receptive to our proposals, others ask why the Soviet Union is raising and firmly holding the banner of human rights. All these questions will be discussed in Moscow. They are resisting. Particular resistance is coming from the United States. Many are sympathetic to the proposal. It is difficult to predict conclusively the outcome of Vienna debates on this issue, but many, I stress, support and sympathize with this proposal.

I think it would be a mistake to say that this proposal will not bear fruit.

[Grachev] But nevertheless, if you permit me, Valentin Sergeyevich, I think that even in this puzzling reaction of the Western powers to our proposal on a Moscow conference on humanitarian cooperation one can already feel the hypocrisy with which the Western powers have attempted to speculate on the problem of human rights over a long period of time, addressing it in almost procuratorial fashion in relation to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries while adopting a position of some kind of champions in the question of ensuring human rights.

I think that even here the very proposal of a Moscow humanitarian conference plays a very important role, similar to the role played by the Bern meeting about which Anatoliy Gavrilovich spoke. When matters turn not to words but to deeds, particularly in this most notorious sphere of humanitarian cooperation, when matters in Bern turned to contacts between people and to a coordinated document, and when it was required to sign it insofar as the text was already agreed upon, it turned out that the U.S. delegation essentially was bluffing by proposing these questions for such a long period of time and with such ardor as an almost primary demand addressed to the socialist countries.

[Zorin] You talk about hypocrisy. Let us imagine ourselves in the position of our partners at the talks if we cannot sympathize with them. It is difficult for the poor things. Everything is habitual for them. There is no need to think too much. The stereotypes were developed in advance and they worked: Rights there are guaranteed while rights here are violated. They sailed down this path when all of a sudden they are placed before an entirely new situation. Something new must be invented, some entirely new arguments and propaganda moves must be found, and I do not know, maybe I am wrong, but I have the impression that so far this kind of single system of arguments has not been found yet.

Regarding this, we see that figure of silence and attempts to evade things Anatoliy Gavrilovich mentioned when he said that the Soviet proposal made by the Soviet foreign minister in Vienna on the Moscow conference has in reality not been rejected, it is simply being ignored. They are attempting to... [changes thought] I do not know, Anatoliy Gavrilovich, how it works in diplomatic channels, but if you take channels of public discussion then the Western press is simply ignoring it.

[Kovalev] There is a method in diplomacy of taking things apart.

[Zorin] What does this mean?

[Kovalev] It means to take one question to one forum, another one to another forum, the third to a third one so that there would be practically nothing left over for the conference in Moscow.

[Zorin] I see. Well, we have already touched on a number of aspects of how our Western partners try to interpret the Helsinki agreements, in their own manner, to say the least. I would like to touch upon another problem. It is a known fact that the affirmation of the existing established borders in Europe was an important aspect in Helsinki. This was widely discussed some time ago and one should not forget this now either. Very recently, however, such an influential person as the U.S. President, twice touched upon the problems of the existing division of Europe. First it was at the Berlin Wall and now, in his Saturday radio address to his fellow countrymen. When I read both of the U.S. President's speeches, I began wondering whether or not his assistants had shown him the text of the Helsinki documents, the text of the Helsinki Act. This was the question that arose in my mind, and I would like you, Andrey Serafimovich, to dwell on this matter.

[Grachev] It is difficult for me to speak for the U.S. President's assistants, Valentin Sergeyevich. Besides, one should keep in mind that the Helsinki Final Act is quite a bulky document. We also know that it is, by the way, the habit of the U.S. President to repeatedly use an image or an argument he particularly liked or just remembered, so I would not be surprised if his discourse on the Berlin Wall -- his wailing over the wall, excuse the bad pun -- will be repeated several times under various circumstances. However, I think it proper now to dwell on the things behind this discourse and these, to a certain extent, melodramatic dramatizations, which are, by the way, periodically staged in West Berlin not only by the U.S. President but also by some other Western leaders.

You see, the matter lies in a subject so popular among Western politicians -- overcoming the division of Europe. The subject is extremely important and urgent in principle. It is a subject that we are, undoubtedly, ready not only to discuss but also to act upon because, in principle, all efforts of the Soviet Union, including its contribution to the Helsinki process and the disarmament initiatives for the European Continent, are directed precisely toward overcoming the division of Europe into opposing military-political groups hostile to each other.

One should mention here a political forgery, I would say, by many Western leaders when they discuss overcoming the division of Europe. They speak not about overcoming the wall of hostility, distrust, and suspicion or overcoming the division of Europe into two opposing military systems but rather about attempts to question the postwar settlement and attempts to question the right of another political system to exist in Europe, and eventually the existence of the borders of independent states, because one should not forget that when one speaks about the Berlin Wall it is the GDR national border that is being discussed.

Well, discussing this topic, the means of overcoming the split in Europe and Europe's return to the path, which, by the way, is indicated by the Helsinki Final Act, I think that one should follow the path of concrete practical actions rather than propagandist dramatizations and performances.

[Zorin] I would like to close today's discussion with a question that may appear at first glance to be simple. What is the present significance of the Helsinki process and the Helsinki documents? Why do we continue to pay such attention and attach such significance to them, Anatoliy Gavrilovich?

[Kovalev] I think we have, to a considerable extent, answered this question during our discussion, because it covers all facets of life of the European people, their present and future, and their desire for an undivided Europe, which is at the heart of the USSR's European policy and which is being received so well by many West European countries -- NATO members, the neutrals, and the nonaligned. Many expect -- we have already discussed the humanitarian issues -- that the Vienna meeting will solve the questions regarding a forum to discuss the variety of questions and problems related to reducing conventional arms and armed forces, and tactical and nuclear arms. All these questions are vital questions of security. The Warsaw Pact member countries proposed at the Berlin Political Consultative Committee meeting that a foreign ministers conference be held in Vienna to give a corollary impetus to the Vienna meeting. The European process promotes and widens the framework of the East-West dialogue worldwide, particularly in Europe. A fresh approach to holding talks is needed now.

A bulletin of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs was published a few days ago. It carries the account of the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the conference of diplomatic workers held in May last year at the ministry. It was the first such conference on the history of Soviet diplomacy. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee made the following, I would say, demand of diplomacy: One of the decisive forms of diplomacy is conducting talks. They must be conducted with the good knowledge of one's aims and without creating dead-end situations for either oneself or the other side.

It is unforgivable to think that our partners are more stupid than we are. One cannot permit a situation in which the persistence in maintaining this or that position grows into a senseless stubborness, that a Soviet representative be named Mr Nyet. This is a demand made on us, on Soviet diplomacy, which is now undergoing a process of restructuring. Of course, this is also a demand on the diplomacy of our partners. We expect the same kind of flexibility and common sense from their side. Then a dialogue will be fruitful.

Hence, giving a comprehensive answer to your question, I would like to emphasize that the Helsinki process and the Helsinki Final Act are a common heritage of the European people. The Final Act must be cherished while augmenting joint and collective efforts aimed at building the undivided Europe.

[Grachev] I think that Europe in principle cannot continue to suffer the intolerable and unjustifible gap in political opportunities created 12 years ago by the Helsinki Final Act, which has been strengthened today by the new impetus given by the innovative, bold, and constructive foreign policy of the USSR and socialist states -- the gap between these opportunities and practical cooperation in political, military, economic, and humanitarian spheres. The path to this is indicated by the Helsinki Final Act.

You remember that some time ago, I think shortly after World War II, the well-known German II philosopher Oswald Spengler wrote a famous book entitled The Twilight of Europe. It was a gloomy prophecy of an almost unavoidable breakdown and disintegration of the European civilization. I do not know if we have sufficient grounds to call the Helsinki Final Act the dawn of Europe, but I think that we have the right to expect from the Final Act the prerequisites for strengthening the common European self-consciousness, and, above all, definite progress in all aspects of European cooperation.

[Kovalev] Since you have referred to a philosopher, and "The Twilight of Europe," allow me to add Aleksandr Blok's lines of verse:

I madly wish to live, to immortalize all existing, to humanize the impersonal, to incarnate the unrealized. I think, it has something in common with the way we look upon the processes taking place in Europe and their future.

[Zorin] Well, this is an excellent and poetic ending for our program. Our discussion has shown again that good seeds give good shoots maybe not immediately, but with time, and people are waiting for these shoots. They cherish them, and our historical optimism is connected with this.

Our broadcast time has ended. It remains for me to thank you for taking part in today's discussion and to thank our television viewers for their attention. Until our next meeting in our Studio 9, thank you.

ARBATOV, MOYNIHAN INTERVIEWED ON PERSHINGS

LD190058 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] [Announcer] A U.S. Senate delegation led by Senator Daniel Moynihan is in the USSR at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet. On Tuesday, the senators discussed prospects of Soviet-American relations with leading Soviet experts at the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute in Moscow. After the discussion our reporter, Sergey Goryachev, took an interview with Senator Moynihan and the head of the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute, Georgiy Arbatov.

[Goryachev] First of all, I would like to thank both of you for this opportunity to talk, both of you here, and my first question is to our guest, Senator Moynihan: What are your objectives? What do you want to achieve by visiting the Soviet Union now?

[Moynihan] We came -- Senator Sanford, Senator Sarbanes, and I -- with the principal interest of to learn more about the changes that have been talked about, announced and proposed, perestroyka -- do I have that right? -- glasnost. Well, we had a meeting yesterday with members of the Supreme Soviet, the Soviet of the Union, including the speaker, Mr Tomakov [as heard] and had the opportunity to say that we felt it, that our two nations were very close to concluding a treaty with respect to intermediate nuclear forces which would be the first treaty in history where two parties agreed to the actual elimination and destruction of nuclear weapons. We thought that was a major event.

[Goryachev] Thank you. Now the same question goes to Dr Arbatov. What are your aims and what do you want to achieve by talking to the U.S. senators?

[Arbatov] I know for one thing that the situation will not become worse, and I hope very much that it becomes better when we are talking. We haven't talked for a too long time and have seen that it can bring us only into misperceptions, misunderstandings, and exacerbate the troubles we have anyway. And it is high time that this becomes a routine operation which is done on a routine basis, as a (?mark) for both members of executive and legislative and all other bodies of government -- that they meet each other, that they can discuss with each other and improve the understanding of the other side. I am personally absolutely sure that with all the differences in interests, even we can cooperate in much broader fields than we do up till now and this is just one of the efforts to make it easier.

[Goryachev] Thank you. Let's talk about the INF treaty. Senator, you have already touched upon this problem. This INF treaty seemed to take us off the ground in terms of doing things rather than talking about them, but there is a problem: the U.S. warheads in West Europe, in West Germany. What is your position on these warheads?

[Moynihan] Our position is that they are, that they've always been there, they're an ageing force, we've not negotiated the British forces in this regard nor yet the French. These are not a problem for anyone. Let us not suppose that if we have this treaty there is going to be...[changes thought] somehow nuclear weapons are just going to disappear; they're hardly the case. [as heard] What we have done is show that you can reach, if we do it, you can reach agreement to reduce the numbers of certain specific weapons, and we should. And I think that's probably all I should say.

[Goryachev] In other words, if I got you right, you come in favor of the warheads being kept in West Germany?

[Moynihan] Yes.

[Goryachev] Dr Arbatov, your position?

[Arbatov] Well, my position's a different one. I can explain why. These are American warheads and the Americans raised the problem of smaller range nuclear weapons, and therefore they for a moment forgot that 72 of them are on German missiles, actually American missiles which (?have been) sold to the Germans. And the fact that we made some concessions, having agreed at this moment to just ignore British and French weapons, doesn't mean that we can do it here again, and I think that the Americans must understand and should understand, also, that if we conclude this treaty there will be 671 Soviet weapons removed, launchers, and 380 American. So, 300 more Russians. I don't think they should make it stop. It would be even in their interests because of 82 [as heard] German weapons, especially if they are outdated.

[Goryachev] Okay, Senator Moynihan, you have something to say about this?

[Moynihan] Yes. I have to say: Let Radio Moscow tend to its own affairs. We have excellent negotiators in Geneva and I'm sure they'll do a good job.

[Announcer] The affair we have to tend to at Radio Moscow is providing our listeners with both perspectives on this issue. That was an interview with Senator Daniel Moynihan and the head of the U.S. and Canada Studies Institute, Georgiy Arbatov, by our reporter Sergey Goryachev. A U.S. Senate delegation is in the USSR at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet.

PRAVDA UKRAINY REPORTS U.S. ENVOY'S KIEV VISIT

Attends Exhibition Ceremony

AU171313 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Aug 87 p 4

[Unattributed report: "An Ambassador's Visit"]

[Text] J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, recently spent 2 days in Kiev. he participated in the ceremony opening the exhibition entitled "Data Processing in the Life of the United States." The guest visited the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and held talks in the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

During the visit to the Ukrainian Ministry of culture, Minister Yu. A. Olenenko briefed the ambassador on the development of culture in the Ukraine and on artistic personalities' participation in restructuring. Expanding Soviet-American cultural relations were also discussed.

In an interview with a RATAU correspondent, the ambassador emphasized that the "Data Processing in the Life of the United States" exhibition opened in an atmosphere of goodwill and that it would undoubtedly help to animate economic, scientific, and technical links between the business circles of the two countries.

Talks With Officials

AU171321 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Aug 87 p 4

[RATAU report: "A Conversation in the Ukrainian Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On 13 August, V.A. Masol, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and Council of Ministers chairman, received J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, who was in Kiev on the occasion of the opening of a U.S. computer equipment exhibition in the city.

At the ambassador's request, V.A. Masol gave an account of the restructuring process in the republic. Regarding this, note was made of the growing role and responsibility of the republic's planning and executive organs regarding the republic's increasing share in the all-union fund, in and for the further development of branches, the utilization of raw material and other resources, and protection of the environment. It was emphasized that, under the switchover to full economic accountability, the labor collectives' independence as a central cell in implementing the economic reform launched in the country was increasing.

V.A. Masol and J. Matlock agreed that expanding bilateral contacts, dialogue at various levels, including at the level of youth, cultural exchanges, and using other forms of cooperation, would help to promote mutual understanding between the Soviet and the American peoples, and preserve peace on the planet.

Participating in the conversation were K.P. Boyko, Ukrainian Council of Ministers affairs administrator, and A.V. Churlin, administration deputy chief in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

MATVEYEV DEPLORES REAGAN BERLIN WALL REMARKS

PM130815 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Political Observer V. Matveyev article: "After His Own Way Again..."]

[Text] President Reagan likes to turn to history. True, not just any history. There are many pages of recent history which -- were it in his power -- he would expunge from the peoples' memory. And there are also pages with regard to which he seeks to stage a propaganda show in the spirit of the "cold war."

First of all, let us recall the schemes of the predecessors of the present master of the White House directed against socialist states, including the GDR -- schemes which have certainly not yet been buried in Washington's archives. In the late forties and during the fifties U.S. ruling figures spoke openly of restoring in those countries the prewar ways which are dear to Reagan's heart. They did not just speak of this.

Can we forget how Washington's special services constructed a long tunnel from West Berlin to the GDR capital -- democratic Berlin -- to carry out espionage activities?

This was just one of many instances of such use of West Berlin in what was for the United States and its NATO partners subversive activity against the GDR. It was not for nothing that FRG Chancellor Adenauer proclaimed: "Berlin is the bulwark of the West..."

When faced with hostile activity against itself, every state has the right to take the necessary measures to safeguard its legitimate, sovereign interests. That was what the GDR did 26 years ago when it protected its interests and rights against infringements and subversive activity with appropriate measures along the line of contact with West Berlin.

The U.S. President would now like to fan anticommunist passions with regard to this. To listen to him in connection with his latest "radio address," GDR residents are deprived of the opportunity of contact with the outside world. He speaks as their uninvited advocate. Perhaps it would be better for him to take a look at practices in his own country? There he will undoubtedly find much that requires attention.

As regards GDR residents, the head of the U.S. Administration indulges in deliberate forgery when expatiating on this subject. Hundreds of thousands of GDR residents have the opportunity every year to travel to West Berlin itself, to the FRG, and to other Western countries, including the United States. The point is, however, that they are frequently deprived of the opportunity of visiting the United States by officials in Washington. They are simply refused entry visas. The President should know of this and not engage in verbal exercises of this kind aimed at stirring up a "cold war" atmosphere.

And there is one final point -- but not the least significant -- that I would like to make in connection with the U.S. President's aforementioned "address."

Either he does not realize what the concept of "glasnost" means or he is deliberately muddying the water. It does not mean simply an opportunity to say and write everything that comes into your head. There are laws about this even in the United States. As regards international law and order, in our age, when so much is at stake in terms of war and peace, "glasnost" is an important means of extending mutual understanding, contacts, and cooperation among peoples and states. Much still has to be done here to clear away the big obstacles that exist.

But speeches of directly opposite nature are being made from the rostrum in the White House. Their author poses as judge and arbiter in the international arena and returns once again to "cold war" terminology.

Laurels cannot be earned in this way.

ZORIN PONDERS U.S. OFFICIALS' ANTI-SOVIET REMARKS

LD150027 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 15 Aug 87

["Moscow Viewpoint" by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] The public here in Moscow has reacted with satisfaction to President Reagan's recent statement where he expresses the hope that an agreement on reducing nuclear weapons will be reached between the United States and the Soviet Union in the next few months.

These hopes coincide with those of the Soviet side. We'd like the two sides to work to make these hopes a reality without trying to outplay each other, but we've become eyewitnesses lately to an odd situation. On the one hand, Washington stresses its desire to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union, and on the other, steps up its anti-Soviet rhetoric. Evidence of this is the President' address to the nation over the radio on 8 August. While referring in it to the subject of the so-called Berlin Wall, he distorted facts and spoke about the Soviet Union in a tone inadmissible, not only in relations between partners in important talks but in relations between civilized states in general. Regretfully, this pattern of behavior becomes habitual from Washington. Its officials make no scruples about cursing the Soviet Union, making uncivilized personal attacks on Soviet leaders, or insulting remarks about the Soviet people. Significantly, high-ranking American officials seems to be not inclined to change their tone, even now when certain progress has been achieved on major issues at the Soviet-American talks. Moreover, one gets the impression that Washington leaders have lately been making even more unceremonious and improper references to the Soviet Union than several years ago. And this is despite the fact that the President and his aides keep repeating that mutual trust and a favorable atmosphere are indispensible conditions for achieving an agreement between the two countries.

Why does the White House try to poison relations between our two countries by making unfriendly attacks on the Soviet Union at a delicate time of important negotiations? It does this, in my opinion, for the sake of pleasing the ultraright elements in America, who are discontented with the prospect of having an agreement on nuclear weapons reduction with the Soviet Union. Sentiments of this kind, however, run counter to the hopes expressed by the President concerning this agreement. I believe that such a noble undertaking as the preparation of a mutually acceptable arms control agreement requires more than anything else mutual restraint and a deferential treatment of partners in the negotiations.

U.S. APPOINTEE TO UN COMMISSION 'HATES CUBA'

LD151015 Moscow TASS in English 0835 GMT 15 Aug 87

[Text] Havana August 15 TASS -- TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev reports:

The Reagan administration has appointed Cuban counter-revolutionary Armando Valladares Perez as the U.S. representative to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, thereby demonstrating to the world once again that its "concern" for human rights is a sham.

The news of the appointment of that "champion" of human rights to the U.N. commission has aroused anger among the Cuban people. A police official during the hated Batista regime and a member of a sabotage gang in Havana after the pro-American dictatorship was overthrown, Valladares was detained red-handed by security agents who found 17 bombs, plastic explosives, automatic weapons and ammunition in his home.

Cuba's revolutionary trial proved the terrorist's guilt beyond doubt and sentenced him to a term in prison. After being released this year, Valladares hurriedly left Cuba and soon surfaced in Washington where he was given an affectionate welcome.

Deceit and hypocrisy have always been characteristic of Valladares and his ilk, as well, incidentally, as their bosses.

While in jail, the criminal at one time simulated partial paralysis and at another attempted to pass himself off for a poet "suffering for his convictions". He had to abandon the "invalid"'s role after being exposed as a malingerer. The "poet"'s shoes also turned out much too big for him -- his "creativity" left not a trace in literature. He is well known only among the renegades in the CIA's employ. And now the man will represent the United States in the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. How can this peculiar choice of the Reagan administration be explained?

The answer is simple: the new-minted representative hates Cuba and other socialist countries. All indications are that it is this sentiment that today prevails in Washington's official quarters which are out to sabotage the activities of the United Nations and its working commission at all costs and erode trust among nations.

Speaking at a news conference in the UN headquarters, Cuba's ambassador to the United Nations Oscar Ormas Oliva described Valladares' appointment as further evidence of how the Reagan administration "cares" about human rights.

WASHINGTON TO CONTINUE AID TO NICARAGUAN CONTRAS

LD171508 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Washington August 17 TASS -- The United States does not intend to stop supporting the contras, it was stated on Sunday by the White House chief of staff Howard Baker. He said President Reagan almost certainly would ask Congress to allocate money to provide additional military aid after September 30, the date of the expiry of what amounts to an ultimatum made by the United States to Nicaragua.

Judging by press reports, the plan of a peace settlement in Central America, which was worked out in Guatemala by the leaders of five states of the region and enjoys extensive support in Latin America, has caused confusion in Washington. Not daring to reject outright this plan which actually deals a blow at the policy of U.S. military and economic diktat in the region, the administration is starting a vigorous campaign of at least neutralising it at the beginning.

This campaign will be started by a series of meetings that the U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz will have with American ambassadors in Central American countries. The British FINANCIAL TIMES describes this campaign of diplomatic pressure as an attempt to find ways of securing American interests in the region which are personified by the U.S.-supported contras.

THE NEW YORK TIMES notes that the administration does not know how to react to the Guatemala agreement. According to officials, the paper says, differences over what the reaction of the United States to this plan should be were one of the prime causes of the sudden retirement last week of the U.S. special envoy in Central America Philip Habib.

The Austrian newspaper DIE PRESSE writes that "as in the past, U.S. policy in Central America is both contradictory and helpless. On the one hand, the United States continues to regard the contras as the only instrument of putting pressure on the Nicaraguan Government. On the other hand, Washington realises that the contras in no way embody the future of Nicaragua. Peace in Central America largely depends on the way the American Administration will solve this contradiction of its foreign policy."

PROTESTS, STRIKES IN SOUTH KOREA CONTINUE

LD190530 Moscow TASS in English 2309 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Tokyo August 18 TASS -- Eighty thousand demonstrators marched today through the streets of the South Korean city of Ulsan demanding higher wages, guaranteed employment and genuinely free unions in the country. It was the second day of protests by Ulsan residents in support of workers who went on strike after the management decided to close one of the city's largest enterprises, Hyundai. Fifty bus-loads of armed police watched the protesters as they marched through the streets to a stadium where they held a rally.

On Monday Hyundai workers occupied shops and declared a strike. In reply police stormed the factory, injuring around 30 people.

There has been a sharp rise in the struggle of the working people for their rights against the background of general democratic demands of the country's population. Protests are mounting every day. Labour disputes hit 299 companies on Monday as against 395 today.

Dictator Chon Tu-hwan called today an emergency meeting of the cabinet. He threatened to take "resolute measures" against what he called outside forces that foster and provoke strikes. Chon Tu-hwan demanded that the workers agree to the so-called peace and legal solution of the current labour disputes and promised that the authorities would stay neutral. On the whole, however, his statement was viewed as a hint on the possible new repressions against opposition forces which try to link the current strikes with the general struggle for democratisation, against the pro-American dictatorship.

IRANIAN AMBASSADOR'S MEETING IN MOSCOW REPORTED

LD181141 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian 1030 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Nasar Hayrani-Nobari, ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to Moscow, met with Yazkuliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and submitted a message from Foreign Affairs Minister Velayati. During this meeting the two sides discussed the recent tragedy in Mecca. Our country's ambassador said: You are a representative from the Muslim inhabited region of the USSR and more than 50 million Muslims live in the Soviet Union. It is necessary that the Muslims of the USSR should be made aware of the tragedy which occurred through the joint cooperation of U.S. imperialism and the Saudis. In order to make up for its defeat in the Persian Gulf, U.S. imperialism tried to inflict a blow on the Islamic world and of course the Muslims of the world will take revenge on the United States for the blood of their dear martyrs.

Yazkuliyev said: The Mecca incident is a regrettable tragedy. He added: In this connection, we offer our sympathy to the bereaved families of the Mecca tragedy.

IZVESTIYA NOTES RAFSANJANI REMARKS ON MINES

PM181555 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Shevchenko report: "Persian Gulf: Tension Not Decreasing"]

[Text] Kuwait -- The U.S. helicopter carrier Guadalcanal with eight helicopters on board passed through the Persian Gulf and dropped anchor 30 km north of the island of Bahrain.

Helicopters equipped with minehunting apparatus will be used when Kuwaiti tankers under the U.S. flag are being escorted by the U.S. Navy.

Tension will increase as long as the U.S. Navy is in the Persian Gulf, and any unexpected incidents are possible, Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, speaker of the Iranian Parliament, declared. He again demanded the withdrawal of foreign ships from the Gulf. Iran has everything necessary to force the Americans to get out of the region. We can place mines in the Persian Gulf as easily as we can sow seeds. We have our own mine production plant and we have no shortage of mines. If deliveries of Iranian oil through the gulf are halted, then all exports of oil from the Persian Gulf countries, including via oil pipelines, will become impossible, Rafsanjani noted.

A communique circulated by the Iraqi military command reports that Iraqi aircraft raided Iranian oil installations near the city of Ahvaz in Khuzestan Province. This is retaliation for Iran's continuing aggressive actions against Iraq, the communique says.

The continuing escalation of tension in the gulf is causing concern in the countries of the region. Kuwait has asked the five permanent UN [Security Council] members to step up their efforts to fulfill Resolution No. 598, which demands an immediate cease-fire between Iran and Iraq. It is essential that this resolution be put into effect as soon as possible, a Kuwaiti government statement notes, otherwise the conflict may expand significantly.

LIBERIAN TANKER FIRED UPON IN GULF OF OMAN

LD181943 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] London August 18 TASS -- An unidentified patrol boat today fired two missiles at the Liberian tanker Osco Sierra in the Gulf of Oman, REUTER reports. One of them hit the ship.

The incident happened 45 miles to the east of port Al-Fujayrah in the United Arab Emirates. There were no casualties among the tanker's crew.

The tanker is operated by a Norwegian company.

WESTERN MEDIA CITED ON GULF, PUBLIC REACTIONS

LD130849 Moscow TASS in English 0757 GMT 13 Aug 87

[Text] Nicosia August 13 TASS -- The coastal patrol service of the United Arab Emirates said that one of the mines detected outside the entrance to the Persian Gulf had again been lost sight of. Another mine spotted near an anchorage off the coast of the United Arab Emirates was exploded by gunfire from a helicopter. Meanwhile, reports have appeared on the spotting of the fifth mine over a week in the waters of the Gulf of Oman, where the tanker Texaco Caribbean hit a mine.

According to reports from London, the British Government's decision of the dispatch to the Persian Gulf waters of four minesweepers and one combat support ship has aroused such a hue and cry around their preparations for the cruise that it can be compared with the reaction started by the preparations for the dispatch of a British naval squadron to the southern Atlantic during the Falkland crisis. This was the commentary of the ITV television company on the reaction in Britain to the reunification by the Tory cabinet of its former stand of "limited interference" in the region taken under the pressure of the "senior partner" -- the United States.

On Wednesday, the ships were named which are to leave the Scottish port of Rosit and approach the waters of the Gulf in roughly a month. They are the minesweepers Bysister, Hareworthy, Brackon and Brocksby as well as the combat support ship Abdiel.

On the eve of the departure of the "minisquadron" for the Persian Gulf area, the British mass media are vying with each other in publicising the miracles of the technology with which the ships included into it are equipped. It is reported, for example, that they are almost completely made of high-strength fibre glass plastic, which makes it possible to ensure most effective anti-magnetic protection from mines. The ship engines are mounted on special suspensions making it possible to reduce vibration to a maximum and successfully stave off the activation of mine detonators which react to noise effects. The potentialities of mine sweeping equipment of the minesweepers are discussed in an even greater detail: They include the latest sonar equipment, "minisubmarines" equipped with television camera and remote-control manipulators which are capable of activating mines under water automatically. The shortcomings of the ships, among which are insufficient fixed armament, are mentioned.

In this stream of information on military technology the commentaries are lost on the possible political consequences of the current decision of the Conservative government. Official London is trying to impress on the public that this decision was taken independently, irrespective of the massive pressure by the USA and that the very dispatch of the minesweepers to the Persian Gulf pursues the sole aim of ensuring the "safety of commercial shipping". Yet even these declarations are often controversial.

Thus David Mellor, British minister of state for foreign office, admitted in a BBC programme that this step does not guarantee the safety of the British merchant ships staying there, and Admiral William Stavely, chief of staff of the British Navy, bluntly said that the crews of the British minesweepers had been ordered to act correspondingly if the Iranians were caught in the act of planting mines.

Trying to substantiate the dispatch of ships British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher told newsmen that if British naval ships or civilian tankers could hit mines, why the decision to dispatch minesweepers aroused so much astonishment.

As far as the reaction of political opposition is concerned, it expresses growing alarm over the prospect of Britain's drawing in an explosive regional conflict at a distance of more than 6,000 miles from its shores. As Gerald Kaufman, Labour Party shadow foreign secretary, said on Wednesday, this decision of the Tory cabinet was like an attempt of walking on the edge of a knife.

Commenting on the stand of Britain and France the BBC television company notes that however much London and Paris may try to assure that the dispatch of their naval ships to the Gulf area is not tantamount to their drawing into the conflict in the region, everybody understands that this is by no means so. The continuing concentration of naval forces in the Gulf creates already now the danger of an armed incident, the television company said in its report.

Italy's reaction to the developments around the Persian Gulf was spelled out on Italian television on Wednesday by Italy's foreign minister Giulio Andreotti. The initiative of the U.N. Security Council, he said, is making progress, even if this is slow progress, even if it is by far slower progress than we would like. But it is necessary to support it since only this initiative makes it possible to end war (between Iran and Iraq, TASS note).

If both countries do not stop the war, he noted, it will be necessary to take appropriate measures and this is to be done again by the United Nations Organization. He said that he did not see any other option and sincerely believed that that was a responsible option. The Italian foreign minister noted that this was not only his idea, but the stance taken by his government.

Charles Redman, spokesman for the U.S. State Department, accused the Iranian authorities of obstruction and procrastination as regards the peaceful efforts of the U.N. aimed at a settlement of the Iran-Iraq conflict. The Iranian response to the resolution of the U.N. Security Council of July 20, he said, is, as a matter of fact, its denunciation. Speaking in Washington on Wednesday, he said that if there was no positive change in the Iran's current negative stand, the U.S. Administration believed that the U.N. Security Council should take measures to ensure the implementation of the resolution by Iran.

A spokesman for the Pentagon told a briefing for newsmen that the helicopter carrier Guadalcanal, on board which there are eight Sea Stallion minesweeping helicopters, will enter the Persian Gulf next week. Some delay as compared with the plans announced earlier, the UPI agency noted was a result of a failure of the ship's electrical equipment. [sentence as received]

PDPA APPROVES RESULTS OF NAJIB-GORBACHEV MEETING

LD150848 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 15 Aug 87

[Text] Kabul August 15 TASS -- The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) has discussed and approved the results of the July 20 meeting in Moscow between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Najib, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee.

It said, after hearing Najib's account of the talks, that they had been proof of the continuing consolidation of traditional Afghan-Soviet friendship and a further step in strengthening contacts between the PDPA and the CPSU.

It was noted with satisfaction at the Political Bureau's sitting that the Mosocw meeting had demonstrated a complete concurrence of the sides' views on the national reconciliation policy adopted by the PDPA to achieve peace in Afghanistan.

On behalf of the party and the Afghan people, the Political Bureau expressed cordial gratitude to the Soviet leadership and all Soviet people for their all-round fraternal assistance to Afghanistan.

PAKISTANI, MUJAHIDIN 'GOONS' ATTACK PUSHTUN TRIBES

PM111559 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Yu. Shtykanov article under the rubric "Remarks Apropos": "Goons Versus Pushtuns"]

[Text] The attention of the Afghan and Pakistani public is once again riveted on the "zone of the free tribes." Here in the region of Kurram (Northwest Frontier Province of Pakistan) fighting continues between Pushtun Turi tribe formations and Pakistani regular troops, which are supported by counterrevolutionary dushman gangs. The crash of heavy artillery bombarding Pushtun settlements can be heard in the mountains. Peaceful people are perishing under the wreckage of houses and explosions of shells. More than a dozen villages have already been demolished and the center of Khurram City has been completely destroyed.

New victims cover the path of the Pakistani soldiery and its accomplices from the Afghan counterrevolutionary camp. The aim of Islamabad's present punitive action is to intimidate the Pushtuns, to use violence to force them to abandon their traditional settlement areas, and to create new bases in this area directed against Afghanistan.

"The zone of the free tribes" is the historical territorial home of the Pushtuns. From the end of the 19th century there has existed on the maps the so-called "Durand Line" imposed on the Afghan rulers of the time by the British colonialists, separating the possessions of the British Empire from unconquered Afghanistan. However, not one of the subsequent Afghan governments recognized this line as a border. Nor was it recognized by the numerous Pushtun tribes which had inhabited these lands from time immemorial.

After the partition of India in 1947 Pakistan's ruling circles hypocritically assured the Pushtuns that their internal autonomy and other freedoms would be retained. However, in the ensuing years the free tribes have been subjected to discrimination, ruthless exploitation, and repressions.

Following the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan increased attention was paid to the "zone of the free tribes" on the part of the Afghan counterrevolution, the Pakistani regime, and the U.S. special services. Camps, transit bases, and dumps were set up here by bandit organizations. The Pushtun tribes were a speck of dust in the eyes of the dushmans and their patrons.

This is the source of Islamabad's present policy with regard to the "free zone" and the punitive raids against the recalcitrants. This is not the first time military operations have been undertaken here. It was the same at the end of 1985-beginning of 1986 when Pakistani troops conducted a broad offensive in the Khyber Pass region. Then it was the Afridi and Shinwari tribes who were subjected to acts of repression. The Pakistani authorities wanted to teach the Pushtuns an "object lesson" and break their opposition to the attempts to use their ancient lands as a "passageway" for armed sorties against the DRA.

Incidentally, U.S. military advisers took part in the punitive operation against the Afridi and Shinwari tribes. Their participation is not excluded this time, either. Some people in Washington would very much like to purge the "free zone" of the tribes and put it at the complete disposal of the Afghan counterrevolution. The so-called "mujahidin" need an incentive now more than ever before because the policy of national reconciliation proclaimed by the DRA Government is gaining increasing numbers of supporters even among the forces of the opposition.

The Pushtun tribes, who have cooperated with one another from time immemorial, are united in the face of a common enemy. They acted together during the attack on the Afridi and Shinwari tribes, and they are also rallying their ranks now that a threat looms over the Turi tribe. Their joint protest in connection with recent events indicates that in the event of further escalation in Kurram the Pushtuns will urge the tribes of the whole zone to support their brothers from the Turi tribe.

The Pushtuns are not alone in their just struggle. The sympathy of people of good will is on their side.

INDIA'S 40TH INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY HAILED

LD131255 Moscow TASS in English 1142 GMT 13 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 13 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov:

On the 40th anniversary of its independence the Republic of India stands before the world as country following its own road of development and demonstrating modern, broad and realistic approaches to the solution of urgent international problems -- the kind of new thinking which is the only factor today that can ensure peace, security and stability on this planet.

India is playing an oustanding role in the campaign for nuclear disarmament, social progress and justice, for equitable relations among all states.

It remains one of the recognized leaders and active participants in the Nonaligned Movement one of the founders of which was Jawaharlal Nehru, a great sone of the Indian people.

The experience of that country in defusing crises and settling regional conflicts by means of negotiations on the basis of a reasonable compromise (the latest example is the agreement on the settlement of the Tamil-Sinhalese conflict) deserves most careful attention.

The 40th anniversary of India's independence is also the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. This is why rejoicing at the achievements of the friendly country in speeding up development, strengthening national unity and consolidating independence, the U.S.S.R. notes with satisfaction that Soviet-Indian relations are developing dynamically. The same is true of cooperation between the two countries which is an important stablizing factor in Asia and the whole world -- a factor that has a positive impact on the international climate.

Relations between our two countries which are based on the commitment to the cause of peace and progress, to the campaign for disarmament, for averting a nuclear war and preventing the militarization of space are a convincing argument in favor of such a policy, in fact, a model of such a policy.

The document of historical scope signed by the leaders of the U.S.S.R. and India during Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to India is a fresh confirmation of that. The Delhi Declaration on the principles of a nuclear weapon-free and nonviolent world which is a document of universal import, reflect the ideas of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin and Mahatma Gandhi, two intellectual giants who stood at the cradle of both states -- the ideas that were brilliantly applied by the current leaders of the U.S.S.R. and India to the realities of the nuclear and space age.

On behalf of more than one billion of their fellow countrymen (this is one-fifth of the world's population) Mikhail Gorbachev and Rajiv Gandhi urged the people and leaders of all countries to take undelayed actions which should create a world free from weapons of mass destruction and wars.

They charted the road toward that goal -- the implementation of the ten principles of the declaration. The fact that these principles are not abstract matters for the U.S.S.R. and India can be seen from a series of peace initiatives aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war and easing international tension.

India is celebrating the 40th anniversary of its independence in a difficult situation. Domestic and foreign reactionary forces are conspiring against that country in a bid to destabilize and weaken it, to alter its independent foreign policy and the course toward internal change.

At that time of difficulty for the Republic of India the Soviet Union, acting in the spirit of the treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation signed 16 years ago, is demonstrating solidarity with that country and actively opposing all attempts to put pressure on it, to undermine its unity, international prestige and the outstanding role which India is playing on the world scene.

COMMENTARY VIEWS CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN MIDDLE EAST

TA142046 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1630 GMT 14 Aug 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Another round of U.S.-Soviet consultations on banning chemical weapons has been held in Geneva. Progress was achieved on certain issues. Practical steps to dispel both sides' suspicions were discussed. It was decided that Soviet experts would visit the U.S. installation for dismantling chemical weapons in Tulsa and U.S. experts would be invited to visit the Soviet installation we are building near Chapayevsk. In the veiw of observers, progress in the Soviet-U.S. talks will contribute to the success of the Geneva disarmament conference, where an international charter is now being prepared on a comprehensive, efficient, and enforced ban on chemical weapons and on the elimination of the industrial infrastructure for their production.

What is the connection between this process and the interests of Israel and the Middle East in general? It seems to us that there is a direct connection there. Although official spokesmen in Israel claim that Israel possesses no chemical weapons, there is reliable information which contradicts these claims. For example, the British JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY published an article at the beginning of the year entitled "Israel's Third Option." The first option is conventional warfare and the second is nuclear warfare. The JANE'S commentator believes that chemical weapons for mass destruction have not only been developed in Israel, but are being produced and stored in IDF and Air Force depots. JANE'S notes further that a chemical weapons potential has also been developed in other countries of the Middle East, including those countries that are in a state of war with Israel.

It is also known that Israeli scientists are developing new types of chemical weapons. On several occasions the Israeli press has published evidence of toxic substances being tested in prisons. One substance, in the form of a spray, leaves (?ulce-s) that do not scab on the skin and harm the eyesight.

Even if we believe the official spokesman in Jerusalem, that Israel does not have chemical weapons, this does not mean there is no danger of such weapons being used in the area. After all, the weapons of the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force are stored in Israel. Many sources have learned that there are also nerve gas stores at the disposal of this force. According to the agreement on storing weapons, the IDF can also use this gas in the event of an emergency.

Of course, many matters are shrouded in obscurity on the issue of the Middle Eastern countries' chemical potential, and this is natural; all countries keep such information secret. However, in an atmosphere of suspicion and lack of trust among the area's nations -- as a consequence of 40 years of warfare -- any doubt can only be for the worst. Let us recall the tension on the northern front at the end of last year. The press published a CIA report according to which the Syrians were preparing a chemical offensive against Israel, and the entire area was on the brink of exploding. Afterward it turned out that it had all been a journalists' canard and the tension dissipated, but what would have happened if somebody in the Arab world were to lose his cool after some information was published on Israel's chemical potential?

All the Middle Eastern countries are sitting on hills and mountains of destructive weapons, including, apparently, those that are not so conventional. Every side knows the size of its own potential; it can only guess the size of the other side's potential but, of course tends to assess it according to maximal measurements. This is how every act of the other side that can be, at least theoretically, interpreted as a preparation for war, is assessed. This applies even more if the reference is to moves that can be interpreted as preparation for nonconventional warfare. It is only natural that under these conditions all the sides are prepared, at any moment, to order the launching of a retaliatory blow using all the means at their disposal.

We can therefore conclude that the Middle East is now a zone where there is a special danger of an increase in acts of hostility to a substantively new stage, which could include the use of chemical weapons. Israel is more vulnerable than the Arabs, both because of its relatively small size and because of the high concentration of the centers of government and economy. Therefore it seems to us that the Israeli public has a direct interest in supporting every effort aimed at achieving an international agreement which would ban chemical weapons and eliminate the industrial infrastructure for their manufacture.

PLO'S QADDUMI SENDS MESSAGE TO FOREIGN MINISTER

LD181757 Algiers Voice of Palestine in Arabic 1702 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] Brother Abu al-Luft [Faruq Qaddumi], head of the PLO's political department, sent a written message to the Soviet foreign minister. The message was conveyed by the PLO charge d'affaires in Moscow during his meeting with a number of officials at the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

It has been learned from PLO sources in Moscow that the message concerns developments in the Palestinian issue and the efforts aimed at holding an international peace conference on the Middle East.

These sources stressed that the Brother leader Abu 'Ammar [Yasir 'Arafat], chairman of the PLO Executive Committee and commander in chief of the Palestinian Revolution Forces, will soon pay an official visit to the Soviet Union.

START OF U.S.-EGYPT 'BRIGHT STAR' EXERCISES

LD151403 Moscow TASS in English 1221 GMT 15 Aug 87

[Text] Cairo August 15 TASS -- Joint U.S.-Egyptian maneuvers codenamed "Bright Star '87" began in Egypt today.

It was officially announced that the American forces involved in the war game include Army, naval and air units.

Plans for the large-scale exercise, in which a total of 9,000 U.S. and as many Egyptian servicemen are taking part, include landing an amphibious assault party on Egypt's Mediterranean coast, simulating the seizure of an "enemy" strongpoint in the western (Libyan) desert and practicing rocket and artillery fire as well as aerial bombings with live ammunition.

The backbone of the U.S. troops in the five-day maneuvers is formed by a contingent from the "Rapid Deployment Force" raised especially for interventionist operations in various parts of the globe.

The progressive local press has pointed out more than once that Washington looks at the "Bright Star" exercise as a phase in the combat training of its armed forces for possible military interference in the domestic affairs of Middle East countries.

The maneuvers on Egyptian territory make it possible to master warfare techniques in the climatic and topographic conditions of the region.

The Egyptian newspaper Al-AHALI noted that "Bright Star" is for the White House also a way of enlisting this country into its strategic military plans in the Middle East and consolidating the American military presence in the explosive region.

Although U.S. spokesmen deny any connection between the maneuvers and developments in the Persian Gulf, local observers believe that the war games' coincidence with the flareup of tension in the Gulf makes them especially dangerous. U.S. adventurist activities to heighten tension in the region pose a real threat to peace and security.

Washington August 15 TASS -- Commenting on "Bright Star '87", UP news agency said Egyptian authorities took pains to avoid publicity for the joint maneuvers with the United States, in an obvious bid to dissassociate themselves from U.S. military interference in the crisis in the Persian Gulf.

The Egyptian Defense Ministry cancelled invitations sent to foreign military attaches and correspondents to attend the exercise, UPI reported.

The official Egyptian press did not report the start of the maneuvers.

COMMENTARY LAUDS AFRIKANERS AT DAKAR ANC MEETING

MB171356 Moscow in Afrikaans to South Africa 1745 GMT 24 Jul 87

[Commentary by (Eugin Fristov)]

[Text] In 1927 the famous Russian poet, Aleksandr Sergeyevich Pushkin, wrote: Deep in the mines of Siberia, never lose hope. Your good work and high ideals will never be shattered. The prison walls will fall, and freedom will meet you at the door. When you meet your brother he will present you with (?gifts).

Those words were written 60 years ago by Pushkin to his friends to bolster their courage. The friends were a group of senior officers in the Tsar's army. They were aristocrats. They had organized a revolt against the Czar, demanding the democratization of society. Tsar Nikolay I suppressed the uprising, but he could not crush the ideas. On the 14th we honor these men who sacrificed their position and wealth for the liberation of oppressed people.

What does this example from Russian history have to do with events in our times? Well, we have in mind the bravery of the Afrikaner delegation which has met with the ANC [African National Congress] in Dakar. South Africa today, these people have to be brave not only to criticize apartheid but also to fight it. When these 50 Afrikaners met the ANC they were aware that this organization is the main player in the fight against apartheid. This contact with the ANC will give the South African Government a reason to label the Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa as a supporter of the ANC.

Already rightwing extremists have accused the delegation of high treason. This of course is nonsense. Any person working for a better society in South Africa is a patriot. Nevertheless, one will have to wait until the delegation returns home to see what happens. One must admit that these are courageous people and hope that they will remain so.

Pushkin's friends replied to him in the form of a poem. In it they assured him their courage would never be broken. The Dakar meeting can certainly not be directly compared with the case of Pushkin's friends, but both have one thing in common: courage.

POLISH REFORMS INCREASE ROLE OF SEJM

PM141027 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Poland: Sejm's Role Increases"]

[Text] Warsaw, 12 Aug -- The Sejm's role in increasing and its functions are expanding in implementing reforms in Poland, Polish Sejm Marshal R. Malinowski stated in an interview published today in RZECZPOSPOLITA.

Summing up the results of the work of the country's supreme legislative organ over the past 2 years, he stressed that the progress of the policy of socialist renewal is naturally creating and will create the conditions for consolidating the Polish parliament's positions. The Sejm has increasing influence on the elaboration of reforms and the democratization of life in Poland.

R. Malinowski indicated the great significance of the laws adopted by the parliament on public consultations and a referendum. He stressed the importance of monitoring the execution of legislative acts and of creating the conditions for their full implementation. The qualitative changes in Poland will be reflected in the new edition of the Polish Constitution, the preparation of which is scheduled to be completed in 1991.

At present, the main accent in Sejm activity is shifting to economic questions and above all to the resolution of tasks linked with the second stage of the economic reform. Progress in the economy is of determining significance for consolidating the processes of democratization, the sociopolitical atmosphere, Poland's positions in the world arena, and the potential for active participation in the international division of labor, R. Malinowski noted in conclusion.

U.S. PAPER CRITICIZED FOR ITEM ON SOLIDARITY

PM101341 [Editorial Report] Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 1 August 1987 carries on page 7 a 500-word abridged reprint of an article entitled "Article Found in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR (United States)." The MONITOR article is attributed to its Warsaw correspondent William Erikson. It deals with the publication in Poland of a new journal, RESPUBLICA. This journal, Erikson's article is reported as saying, is regarded as a "sensation" because it is neither a state nor church publication but is the "first private journal to be given legal status in Poland" and is taken to imply that "the Poles have outstripped the Soviet Union in terms of glasnost." The article notes that the journal's editor, Marcin Krol, is a conservative who won the authorities' approval for the legalization of the journal during Solidarity's "heyday" in 1981 and was ready to publish when martial law was imposed in 1982. Krol reapplied for permission in March 1986 and this was granted in March 1987. Krol is quoted as saying that "our aim is to show that at present in our country it is possible to publish legally and at the same time criticize the government." Opposition leaders, however, do not take the government's concessions "seriously." Instead, "they complain that large independent organizations such as the Polish PEN club and the Union of Polish Writers, which was banned in 1983, are still inactive."

The reprinted article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA is followed by a commentary entitled "The Sensation Which Never Was" by the "Polish writer" Janusz Przymanowski. The commentary reads in full as follows:

"I believe that the opinion of the U.S. correspondent that the publication of the private journal RESPUBLICA was a sensation is, in the words of his great fellow countryman Mark Twain, 'greatly exaggerated.'

"What is actually sensational about it? The fact it is possible to criticize the government? Well, this can be done in our country and in the government press, too, if it is a question of a major, socially important problem. Not so long ago, I published an article in TRYBUNA LUDU where I categorically disagreed with the Ministry of Finance and its leader with regard to pricing policy in the book trade. I cited figures to show that for every Z100 spent by customers on books, Z35 go to the treasury in the form of a special income tax. If I drink a liter of milk, however, the Minister of Finance subsidizes me to the tune of Z70, if I travel from Warsaw to Poznan the figure is a full Z2,700, and I bear only 30 percent of the cost price of artificial fertilizers.

"I personally believe that books ought to provide first and foremost a spiritual revenue which should be used to correct the sociomoral atmosphere in society, not the financial side of things.

"My article was printed in full and I was immediately commissioned by NOWE DROGI, the party journal, to write a subsequent article -- on obstacles in book distribution. But if I put a problem in a serious and constructive way with society's benefit in mind, I can cite any name in the press.

"I see the same picture in the Soviet Union, too. The policy of glasnost has 'opened' the way to fair criticism of party workers, ministers, and distinguished cultural figures. Therefore this foreign correspondent is wasting his time trying to drive even a small wedge between us by claiming that the 'Poles have outstripped the Soviet Union in terms of glasnost'. Competition exists, of course. It 'vetoes' writing imbued with a spirit of racism, chauvinism, war propaganda, neofascist ideas, and disrespect toward other states. In any society -- ours and yours alike -- there will be a given number of people who relish such 'vetoes' and argue about 'press freedom.' There are also authors who are not averse to winning themselves some glory or acquiring the thorny crown of a misunderstood genius this way. That is precisely the point of the censored lines in the 'Book Review' section which appeared in a recent issue of RESPUBLICA.

"The Solidarity theorectician Geremek, who is cited in THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, complains that 'all truly independent organizations have been banned.' First and foremost, of course, he has his own organization in mind. But let us return to the recent past. The 1978 crisis did indeed bring into Solidarity's ranks more than 8 billion people who believed its promises. It turned out, though, that the people such as Geremek, Michnik, and Walesa, who headed it, were playing their own game, and the people realized that. And having realized that, they left.

"The imposition of martial law showed the true nature of Solidarity. Within 24 hours 4,500 of its functionaries were arrested. A highly insignificant figure in proportion to a total of 8 million. Surely this 4,500 could not have paralyzed the entire organization if it had been as strong and united as it is portrayed by its discredited leaders?

"It is true that seven people died during martial law. Each life is dear. But it is worth recalling here by the way of comparison that Pilsudski hanged 182 people in the space of 2 years without imposing martial law!

"An armored personnel carrier with a gun stood near my home during the grim days of 1982. By the 3d day some children from the neighboring streets were swinging from the barrel as though on a bar. What is there to write about here, what is there to savor? That is why books published underground are of hardly any interest at all because they consist of cheap and malicious caricatures of socialism and have no artistic merit even in the eyes of dissidents. With the exception, perhaps, of the works of a master such as Tadeusz Konwicki. But even he has already had several offers to publish quite legally. He has refused them. He is afraid of losing his 'image' in the West, where he is considered a victim of persecution and is therefore keenly published and receives royalties in convertible currency.

"I would call RESPUBLICA a safety valve. Even if nonsense is printed, the readers will understand. In my view, it will be taken by about 10,000 people. It will be read by a few more people, perhaps, initially attracted by the appearance of being a 'private journal.' However, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR is indulging in wishful thinking and one can only feel sorry for it.

"As for the PEN club, it actually consists of some very elderly writers who have 'nothing to do' because they are simply not relevant to today's Poland with its concerns insofar as their attitude of opposition is well-known and is their main asset in the West. The following proposal has been put to the PEN club -- give official support to the Polish Constitution, and if you refuse then just whom do you represent? During the days of Solidarity the board of the Union of Polish Writers was headed by Jan-Jozef Szczepanski. The old union included writers and translators. The reorganized union consists solely of writers -- the majority attended the congress and elected a new board, which is working successfully. Therefore the claim that the Union of Polish Writers has 'nothing to do' is a lie. Despite the fact that only a minority remained in opposition, none of them has any right to bear a grudge against the state. Their books are published and Andrzej Wajda has even made a movie 'Chronicle of Love' based on T. Konwicki's story with which he won the 'Golden Film' award in 1986.

"Now a few words about Walesa. When calling him a clown in one passage the U.S. newspaper omits the surname of the official who is alleged to have said that (why such tact?!). I always sign my name and I say what I think: Walesa is a 'primitive life form in a state of grace.' He has a sufficient sense of of self-preservation and the ability to adapt to circumstances and derive the maximum advantage from them. Publicized in the West as a fighter for justice and a Nobel Prize winner, he now drives to work at the shipyard where he is an electrician and he also gives interviews to foreign correspondents. A real angel but without wings. But look what else is on offer! A book by the Polish journalist Jerzy Wilmanski published in Lodz in 1985 quotes a tape-recorded dialogue between Walesa and his brother which has been confirmed as authentic. It ought to be read! The brothers followed each comment with language strong enough to make a hardened sailor blush. They cynically discuss where to place most advantageously the capital gained through Solidarity and pull no punches in their description of their 'union' with the church.

"I would advise people to read this publication to William Erikson. Then he will understand whether it is possible to share power with Lech Walesa and whether this topic is worth writing about."

Przymanowski's article is followed by an item entitled "Stop Press," datelined Warsaw, which reads in full as follows:

"The U.S. Congress' decision, signed by President Reagan, to allocate a further $1 million to the antisocialist elements in Poland is in clear contradiction with the norms of international relations and respect for the sovereignty and independence of other states, TRYBUNA LUDU stresses. This move is the latest attempt at interference in Poland's internal affairs. Washington's policy shows the striking contrast between the recently declared will to improve relations with Poland and develop them on the basis of equality and the practice of interference in Poland's internal affairs using such despicable and unlawful means as that of seeking out new hired agents.

"The recipients of the check signed by the U.S. President have been shown the detailed terms of the 'assistance' offered to them. Those terms are contained in a declaration of the 'National Foundation in Support of Democracy,' in other words, an organization created for struggle against socialist states. The group of Poles in Washington's 'pay' may do 'whatever they want' with this money -- although on the condition that it is spent for the purposes of secret agents and subversion.

"A microscopically small price has been set on the activities of the former Solidarity in comparison with the Nicaraguan contras, for example, out of all proportion to their ambitions and their lackey-like readiness to serve. This can perhaps be explained by the U.S. Administration's confidence that it can buy its agents in Poland very cheaply.

"In Poland's history, 30 pieces of silver have never brought anyone any honor, and the small number of paid agents working for other countries has always been subjected to universal contempt, the newspaper writes.

FURTHER ON HESS DEATH, SPANDAU'S DESTRUCTION

LD181214 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1128 GMT 18 Aug 87

[Text] West Berlin, 18 Aug (TASS) -- Correspondent Vladimir Shtykov reports: The West Berlin Spandau prison which held the Hitlerite war criminals is empty. As has already been reported, its last prisoner died yesterday -- Hitler's former deputy in the Nazi Party, Rudolf Hess, sentenced by the Nuremberg Tribunal to life imprisonment for crimes against the world for preparing for an aggressive war.

Hess was said to be one of Hitler's most fanatical assistants and took a direct part in drawing up fantastic plans for world supremacy. In 1941, in the uniform of a captain of the Air Force, he secretly flew to Scotland to hold secret negotiations for a separate peace. Hess was arrested there and up to the end of the war remained in a prison cell. Up to now details of his stay in Britain have been kept secret,

Spandau, situated in the British-occupied part of Berlin, became the place of imprisonment for Nazi war criminals in 1946, in accordance with the decision of the four Allied Powers. It was also at that time that representatives of the victorious powers arrived at the unanimous conclusion that, following the death of the last prisoner, the prison should be destroyed. This is to symbolize the final victory of the planet's progressive forces over fascism, the irreversibility of punishment for all war criminals, the triumph and justice of the work of legal and court bodies.

Over the past few years, the reactionary forces in the West have been more and more insistent that Hess should be released for humane reasons as an old and ill man. Attempts, moreover, were made in this context to cast doubt on the justice of his Nuremberg sentence and to seek to rehabilitate this Nazi criminal.

U.S., British, and French representatives took a rather peculiar position with regard to this question: Formally dicharging their duties in protecting the Spandau prison, they let it be clearly understood that the demands of those who would have Hess released were close and understandable to them. The USSR's firm position -- that the sentence of the peoples should be carried out to the full -- gave rise to malicious attacks on the part of not only those who did not think fit to conceal their neo-Nazi views, but also on the part of certain Bonn officials. Annually, on Hess' birthday, West Berlin neo-Nazis would gather in front of the entrance to the prison. They demanded a pardon for the Nazi criminal, sang fascist songs, exchanged chauvinist slogans. Strengthened police units assiduously protected Hitler's followers against the just anger of the city's inhabitants. On Hess' death, Spandau ceases to be a place of imprisonment for war criminals. As the British commandant's representative has stated, the prison will be destroyed in the very near future in accordance with the 1946 decision.

12 PEASANTS KILLED BY SOMOZISTS NEAR MATIGUAS

LD190849 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 19 Aug 87

[Text] Managua August 15 TASS -- Twelve Nicaraguan peasants in the vicinity of Martiguas have fell [as received] victim to a bloody repression staged by Somoza mercenaries. They were brutally killed for having refused to collaborate with CIA terrorists who are cynically called by the Reagan Administration "fighters for freedom and democracy".

Journalists were told by residents of that zone that Somoza men are trying hard to avoid clashes with the Sandinist People's Army. They prefer to stage terrorist acts against civilians. Using force, contras herd away peasants to neighbouring Honduras and under the treat of death they are compelled to undergo military training to participate in subversive actions against Nicaragua's legitimate government.

DEMICHEV RECEIVES GUATEMALAN PARLIAMENTARIANS

PM131015 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed "Joint Report on the Stay of Parliamentarians from the Republic of Guatemala in the USSR"]

[Text] Parliamentarians from the Republic of Guatemala paid an official visit to the Soviet Union from 28 July through 5 August 1987 at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They comprised Rodolfo Maldonado Ruiz, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of Congress (leader); Roberto Adolfo Valle, first deputy chairman of Congress; and also Deputies Edmundo Mulet, Jose Roberto Alejos Cambara, and Hector Mayora Dave [name as published], members of the Foreign Affairs Commission of Congresss.

The Guatemalan parliamentarians laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and the Tomb of the Unknown Warrior by the Kremlin Wall.

In addition to Moscow, the Guatemalan guests visited Leningrad and the Kirgiz SSR, familiarized themselves with the activities of organs of state power, and visited industrial and agricultural enterprises.

The Guatemalan parliamentarians were received by P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Meetings and talks were held with L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, and with chairmen and members of standing commissions of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

During the talks, which were held in a friendly atmosphere and a spirit of mutual understanding, the Soviet and Guatemalan parliamentarians exchanged opinions on key international problems and voiced concern at the continuing tension in the world and the growing race for nuclear and conventional arms. The mutual conviction was expressed that ensuring peace and international security is a very urgent, vital requirement of our days.

The sides pointed out that the parliaments of all countries are faced with the very important task of increasing their contribution to the cause of saving human civilization from the threat of nuclear destruction, and in this connection they advocated continuing efforts to end the arms race.

It was emphasized that the realities of the modern world demand that war be excluded from the means of settling conflicts between states.

The Guatemalan parliamentarians' attention was drawn to the Soviet proposals reflecting a new approach to questions of building a nuclear-free and nonviolent world and to the creation of an all-embracing system of international security. It was emphasized that the new Soviet initiatives are aimed at strengthening international stability in the vast region which includes the Pacific basin, which washes the shores of both the Soviet Union and Guatemala.

The parliamentarians noted with satisfaction the Latin American countries' growing role in the world and their contribution to preserving and strengtnening international security and stability and curbing the arms race, advocated the further development and strengthening of democracy on that continent, and came out in support of developing profound cooperation among Latin American states.

Both sides are seriously concerned about the preservation and development of conflict situations in various parts of the planet. They confirmed their mutual conviction as to the urgent need to settle them as quickly as possible by means of negotiations on the basis of ensuring sovereignty and respect for national independence and the right o self-determination without external interference in states' internal affairs.

During the exchange of opinions, the Soviet and Guatemalan representatives spoke in favor of a just political settlement in Central America and called for an end to external pressure and aggression with regard to the countries of that region and to any form of external support which destabilizes peace in the region.

The sides came out in support of the Contadora process and the peaceful resolution of the Central American crisis. The Soviet parliamentarians declared their country's readiness to promote in practical terms the creation of favorable conditions for a settlement in Central America.

The Guatemalan parliamentarians briefed the USSR Supreme Soviet deputies on Guatemala's initiative for the creation of a Central American parliament, as well as on its policy of active neutrality.

The participants in the meetings emphasized the need to establish a just new international economic order, assert equitable and totally discrimination-free trade and economic ties among countries, and ensure states' economic security.

The Soviet and Guatemalan representatives exchanged information on the activities of the two countries' parliaments.

The deputies of the Congress of the Republic of Guatemala were familiarized with the progress of restructuring in the USSR and with the work being done to fulfill the 27th CPSU Congress decisions aimed at accelerating socioeconomic development and democratizing all spheres of the life of Soviet society.

The USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and the members of the Congress of the Republic of Guatemala emphasized their mutual interest in developing and activating Soviet-Guatemalan ties in various spheres and in arranging regular parliamentary exchanges.

IZVESTIYA INTERVIEWS GUATEMALAN POLITICIANS

PM141401 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Aug 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Guatemalan National Congress Deputies Rodolfo Maldonado and Edmundo Mulet by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Kuvshinnikov in Moscow, under the rubric "Interparliamentary Ties": "What Should Relations Between the USSR and Guatemala Be Like?" -- first three paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction; no date of interview given]

[Text] The Soviet Union established diplomatic relations with Guatemala in April 1945. But for most of the years since then, these relations were purely a matter of form.

Between 1954 and 1986 Guatemala was ruled by right-wing authoritarian governments and a civil war was fought in the country. The victory of Vinicio Cerezo, candidate of the Christian Democratic Party, at the general elections crushed the dictatorial traditions and marked the beginning of the difficult process of the return to democracy.

The new Guatemalan Government seeks to develop equal and mutually advantageous relations with all countries. Within the framework of this policy, the Soviet Union was recently visited -- for the first time in more than 4 decades -- by an official delegation of the National Congress of the Republic of Guatemala. IZVESTIYA's correspondent conversed with delegation head Rodolfo Maldonado, chairman of the National Congress Foreign Affairs Commission and member of the ruling Christian Democratic Party's leadership, and delegation member Edmundo Mulet, National Congress deputy from the opposition Union of the National Center.

[Kuvshinnikov] It is only natural for us to be mainly interested in your assessment of the present state and future prospects of Soviet-Guatemalan relations. How would you like to see them in the future?

R. Maldonado: Our visit demonstrates our readiness to somewhat develop Guatemalan-Soviet relations and unfreeze them. Our delegation came to the USSR with the knowledge and approval of V. Cerezo, and this fact alone indicates the importance of the step we have taken. There are quite a few points of contact in our views, arising mainly from the mutual desire for a world abounding in dynamic contacts between countries and people. We sincerely welcome the Soviet foreign policy initiatives.

E. Mulet: This goodwill visit is taking place at the ruling party's initiative. But the idea of the visit was discussed with leaders of all opposition parties represented in the National Congress and aroused no objections.

[Kuvshinnikov] Did all political circles in Guatemala without exception really back the idea of the visit?

R. Maldonado: To be perfectly accurate, we must mention a tiny group of radical conservatives who are less benevolently inclined. But they are in the minority. Of course, our trip certainly does not mean that relations will be finally established from tomorrow -- we have only just begun the process of rapprochement. The strengthening of interparliamentary, economic, and cultural ties will create a base for the expansion of diplomatic and political contacts.

Soviet merchant ships regularly call at Guatemalan ports. We buy from the Soviet Union quite a few cars, especially the "Lada-2121." For our part, we sell sugar and cotton, and talks are in progress on deliveries of coffee which is in no way inferior to Colombian or Brazilian coffee.

[Kuvshinnikov] The authoritarian regimes created an unenviable international reputation for Guatemala. Now, however, judging by Guatemalan officials' statements, the situation in, for example, the human rights sphere has radically changed for the better. From time to time, however, international news agencies report political repressions, tortures, and disappearances of people. How could you explain this situation?

R. Maldonado: There is no point in denying that conservative governments in the past used repressions to stifle popular dissatisfaction. But now you can judge for yourselves: A special standing commission on human rights has been set up under the National Congress. A special prosecutor will soon be elected for cases involving violations of human rights. An end has been put to persecution for political beliefs. The police force has been radically reorganized. The Technical Investigation Directorate -- a repressive organ which had served many dictators -- has been eliminated.

[Kuvshinnikov] I realize that you did not come to the Soviet Union for discussions on questions of domestic policy. But I could not fail to notice Mr Mulet skeptically shaking his head on hearing your assessment. Do the opposition parties hold a different view on this range of problems?

E. Mulet: I can agree with Mr Maldonado's assessment, but only in part. He is right when speaking of the historical tradition of violence in Guatemala. It is therefore impossible to implement immediately, overnight, everything we consider necessary to ensure strict observance of human rights.

I can also agree that the Cerezo government has eliminated the institution of "legalized lawlessness." President Cerezo tried to personally persuade the leading personnel of security organs to end the persecutions and violence. He succeeded in this to a certain extent. But there are still people who remain loyal to the old methods and tasks and disagree with the course of democratization in domestic political life. It is their actions that probably give news agencies reason to report isolated repressive actions.

R. Maldonado: I can cite another fact proving that it is not state organs that are guilty of violence. Many news agencies reported some time ago the kidnapping of a member of the ruling party's leadership. I was the one who was kidnapped.

Three strangers armed with automatic weapons captured me at home, forced me inside a car, and drove out of the city. All the time they were discussing: "What do you think, here? No, we'll be seen here.... How about here? No, it's too dangerous...." All this had a terrible effect on my nerves. Finally they halted at a plot of wasteland and stood me against a wall. I had already said goodbye to life. It appeared, however, that the kidnappers were only trying to frighten me. They were satisfied with a check for 700 quetzales and let me go.

[Kuvshinnikov] Could that have been just an ordinary robbery?

R. Maldonado: No, they said that they belonged to an armed group but, true, did not say which one in particular.

[Kuvshinnikov] But after all, this same method is also used by the right-wing "death squads" to confuse the police....

R. Maldonado: Quite possible. They did have grounds to be displeased -- I was getting ready to travel to Nicaragua at the head of a parliamentary delegation.

[Kuvshinnikov] How do you assess the conflict in Central America?

R. Maldonado: The threat of a global nuclear conflict begins with regional conflicts. Therefore, by advocating a political settlement of the Central American crisis, we are making a contribution, within the framework of our possibilities, to the struggle to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

We categorically object to any attempts to solve Central America's problems by military means.

UKRAINIAN POLITBURO CHIDES RAILROAD OFFICIALS

AU172010 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 13 Aug 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Excerpts] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has approved measures to implement in the republic the directives of the 27th Party Congress and the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum concerning nationality relations and the intensified internationalist and patriotic education of the population, and adopted a decision which will be expounded in the press.

The results of the elections to the local soviets of people's deputies and to people's courts have been examined. Party committees have been instructed to make use of the experience accumulated in the electoral campaign to expand the democratization of public life and to more vigorously engage the working people in restructuring.

The ways of increasing the responsibility of Dnepr Region and Donetsk railroad cadres for fulfilling the transportation plans and for the high-quality preparation of transportation facilities for the 1987-88 winter season have been discussed. It was noted that, in April through July, the aforesaid railroad increased hauling operations 16 percent compared with the first quarter of the current year, and overfulfilled the 7-month plan for conveying coal, petroleum products, metal scraps, fertilizers, salt, and grain. Nonetheless, the railroads are slow to improve their work, and the tasks for eliminating the arrears incurred in the winter season have not been fully accomplished. The targets set for conveying coal to power stations, iron ore, construction materials, and raw materials to industry have not been met. Cars and locomotives have been engaged in an ineffective way. There are serious shortcomings in the organization of passenger conveyance. The railroads and transportation shops at enterprises are behind schedule in their preparations for the winter season. The schedules set for the repair of tracks, loading and unloading mechanisms, and many facilities for passenger and municipal transportation are not being observed.

The leadership and party committees of the Donetsk and Dnepr Region railroad administrations have failed to draw the necessary conclusions from the directives of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) Plenum on the increased responsibility of cadres for the matter at hand. Functionaries who proved to be irresponsible and inefficient in their work are not being brought to account in a concrete way. Restructuring is progressing slowly, and is being insufficiently utilized to intensify hauling operations and to apply economic management methods.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has warned Comrade A.A. Alimov, chief of the Dnepr Region railroad, that if the railroad's work does not improve, the question of his compatibility with the post he holds will be examined. Comrade A.M. Kozhushko, chief of the Donetsk railroad, has been strictly admonished for the shortcomings in the organization of hauling operations and for the lag in preparing facilities for the winter season. Comrade M.Ye. Ryabchiy, Ukrainian deputy minister of ferrous metallurgy, has been requested to improve car unloading operations and the preparation of transportation facilities at metallurgical and coking and chemical plants for the winter season. He has been warned that otherwise he would be brought to account.

The attention of Comrade P.D. Kokotyukha, party committee secretary in the Donetsk railroad administration, and Comrade V. Ya. Solod, party committee secretary in the Dnepr Region railroad administration, has been called to the lack of appropriate control over the accomplishment of government tasks, and to the sluggishness in restructuring and in improving the style and methods of work in the management apparatus.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has obligated railroad chiefs to increase the responsibility of cadres for fulfilling the plans for hauling operations and for all kinds of freight scheduled, and for rendering passengers services more efficient. [passage omitted]

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and Council of Ministers have adopted a decision ensuring steady performance in the republic's national economy in the 1987-88 winter season. [passage omitted]

The ways of intensifying the struggle against drug addiction have been examined. It was noted that, in a number of oblasts, the struggle against this evil continued to be waged without adequate persistence, intensity, and consistency. A particularly disturbing situation has emerged in Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk, Odessa, Nikolayev, and Crimean Oblasts.

Obkoms, gorkoms, raykoms, ministries, departments, executive committees of local soviets, trade union and Komsomol organizations in the republic have been requested to scrutinize the state of the struggle against drug and intoxicant addiction, and to take additional measures.

In connection with the transfer of the city of Kirovskoye in Donetsk Oblast to the category of oblast-subordinated cities, the Central Committee has resolved to create Kirovskiy Gorkom of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Donetsk Obkom and Oblispolkom have been instructed to take the organizational measures necessary.

KIRGIZ PLENUM CRITICIZES 'INERTIA', 'BLUNDERS'

PM190906 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Aug 87 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev report under the rubric "Communists Discuss the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum Decisions" and the general heading "Overcoming Inertia": "Kirgizia"]

[Text] Frunze -- Kirgizia entered the 12th 5-Year Plan with a grave legacy. Extensive development of the economy, an administrative decree style of leadership, and gross blunders in cadre policy led to a situation where the development of the most important sectors of the republic's national economy was retarded. Return on capital in industry has fallen off and the profitability of agricultural production has declined.

However, the first signs of the restructuring can be seen. New forms of economic accountability and the team contract are being introduced. More attention is being devoted to social questions. The changes are particularly marked in the agro-industrial complex. As first secretary A. Masaliyev, speaking at the Kirgiz Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, noted, in the first 18 months of the 5-year plan in the republic 27,000 tonnes of meat and 61,000 tonnes of milk have been purchased above plan. Many industrial enterprises are running smoothly -- the Kadamdzay antimony combine, the Tokmak worsted and spinning factory, the Frunze knitwear association, the 40 Years of October sewn goods factory and others.

But in the republic as a whole, it was said in the report and in the speeches of M. Ibrayev, first secretary of Tokmak Gorkom, N. Semenov, secretary of the Kirgiz Communist Party Central Committee, M. Zubrevskaya, electric winder at the Naryngidroenergostroy administration, and T. Lakman, chairman of the Pobeda Kolkhoz, the situation in the economy is still being rectified too slowly.

Certain collectives in industry chronically disrupt contractual deliveries. Serious concern is caused by the financial position of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Some 15 percent of all the republic's farms ended last year with losses.

All this results from the fact that in many party committees the restructuring is not sufficiently active, it was noted from the plenum platform. People are not managing everywhere to overcome the retarding mechanism, the inertia.

This conclusion was confirmed here at the plenum. R. Kulmatov, first secretary of Osh Obkom, spoke in detail of the planned measures to implement the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum and ways of switching to the new methods of economic management. He started explaining serious failures in industry and in the agrarian sector in the old way, solely in terms of "objective factors": interruptions in material and technical supplies, a fall in purchase prices for tobacco. He was supported by E. Aliyev, chairman of Naryn Oblispolkom:

"Loss-making farms existed in our republic exclusively because of the redistribution of the profit from economically strong collectives. Self-financing will only exacerbate the lamentable position of low-profitability farms."

What conclusion does the speaker suggest? An increase in purchase prices and state subsidies.

The following unexpected turn took place at the plenum during a discussion of the need for a resolute switch to economic methods of economic management, the eradication of parasitic sentiments, and the introduction of full economic accountability. Discussion showed that alongside the republic's party organizations which obtain good results, there are also many which are not keeping up with the dynamic processes taking place in the country today.

Speaking at the plenum, L. Bogacheva, weaver at the Osh Cotton Textiles Production Association, did not gloss over the very complex situation which her collective found itself in after the introduction of state acceptance. The textile workers proved unprepared for its strict, uncompromising demands. As a result, month after month, consumers failed to receive millions of meters of textiles. However, the communist did not seek explanations for the failure "elsewhere":

"We have talked much about quality and drawn up many measures for the transition to state acceptance. But there were too few concrete deeds behind the words."

The chairman of Naryn Oblispolkom also received an answer to his "complaints." The plenum participants learned that on the Kuybyshev Kolkhoz in At-Bashinskiy Rayon alone, three incomplete Dnepr irrigation units worth more than R110,000 are lying about in the machine yard. Even more machinery is rusting on the neighboring Kyzyl-Zhyldyz Kolkhoz. What increase in purchasing prices for agricultural products could compensate for such thriftlessness?

The Kirgiz SSR Ministry of Light Industry was sharply criticized. This sector was one of the first in the republic to go over to self-financing. Although on paper they prepared long ago for this important step, from the very first days of working in the new way the hiccups began. The Kirgiz Worsted Cloth Combine, the Osh Cotton Textiles Association, and the Grunze Footwear Association were in a spin. It was mainly through their "efforts" that the ministry's debt to consumers increased to R13 million. However, the department is still working in the old way. The collegium holds session after session, and numerous decrees are issued. All that is lacking is strict measures against those guilty of omissions, first and foremost against Minister D. Tentiyev, for inertia. The ministry party committee and Frunze Gorkom have tolerated this.

Incidentally, despite the criticism both in the report and in speeches by plenum participants, the minister could not make up his mind to speak. Once again D. Tentiyev avoided answering for his blunders.

But the leaders of two other republican departments -- S. Begaliyev, the Gosplan chairman, and Kh. Dadabayev, the Gossnab chairman -- mounted the platform at the plenum. It is in these institutions, it was noted at the plenum, that many retarding factors are born. Nonetheless the leaders of these departments believe that they are successfully fulfilling the tasks entrusted to them. Their assessment of their own achievements was patently exaggerated.

The course of the plenum showed how difficult it is to master the political methods of economic leadership and how hard certain party workers find it to renounce the habit of interfering in all economic and production affairs. Many speeches looked more like reports by enterprise or farm directors. Not all the speakers tried to look at economic problems from the standpoint of the activity of party organizations.

In the resolution adopted, concrete ways of establishing barriers in the path of the restructuring and unconditionally fulfilling the tasks facing the republican party organization were outlined.

WRITER CALLS FOR 'MONUMENT' TO STALIN'S VICTIMS

AU170702 Paris AFP in English 0122 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow, Aug 17 (AFP) -- A poem by the Soviet writer Anatoliy Jigulin about the brutal treatment he received in a labour camp while Josef Stalin was Soviet leader, has been published in the latest edition of the OGONEK weekly. The poem was accompanied by an appeal in verse by Yevgeniy Yevtushenko for a monument to be built in memory of Stalins' victims.

Mr. Jugulin, 57, who was sent to Siberia in 1949 as an "enemy of the people", said in his account of camp life that three other inmates were shot dead while trying to escape. "I've got scars and certificates, two bullets in the elbow and head," he wrote.

Mr. Yevtushenko's poem calls for a memorial for all those "who wrote the alphabet of the Revolution on a wall with a finger from which the nail had been torn out."

The ZNAMIA literary monthly also published in its latest number a letter from a reader suggesting a monument.

YOUTH LABOR CAMP REGIME, CONDITIONS DESCRIBED

PM171523 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Aug 87 Second Edition p 6

[A. Markovich report: "The Gray Fence"]

[Text] Leningrad Oblast -- Behind a long, gray fence with barbed wire, and heavy, solid iron doors and guard posts stands a camp. The camp is divided into two zones: A residential and a work zone. In the residential zone the same gray four-story blocks with barred windows. The blocks look out on to a spacious square which, depending on the time of the day, becomes either a place for general assembly, a drill square, or a stadium. The work zone contains workshops, assembly shops, and a hotbed where cucumbers and tomatoes ripen throughout the year. All this describes a corrective-labor camp for juveniles sentenced for the first time under articles of the criminal code to imprisonment in a general camp, that is to say, to the least severe regime.

The first and most acute impression is that of ordinariness. The ordinariness of an order established once and for all, of roles assigned once and for all. Sergeants impassively examine the charges (which is what the prisoners are called here) before they leave the work for the residential zone. This humiliating, in its ordinary understanding, procedure is also accepted impassively by the adolescents. Their eyes betray nothing other than boredom and submission. They all look the same. It is only later when I begin chatting to them that I see individuals. People who are guilty, afflicted by fate and circumstances, but individuals. I am regarded with interest: Where are you from, why are you asking, what do you want -- the truth or something "for the newspaper"?

I wanted to know what sort of people the camp charges were, what brought them there, how they would get out?

Captain of Internal Services Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Sukalo, deputy chief in charge of political educational work, looked through the files of personal records he was holding.

"Stealing a motorcycle," he read out. "...A 'Soyuzpechat' kiosk turned over and robbed -- 18 months' imprisonment. These youths will now be going home: An amnesty... These, however, are remaining for the time being: The stealing of a Kama truck, a person knocked down. Five years... The theft of personal property -- 7 years... Why so long? The total loss involved was R43,000. It was not one person but a group of 12 operating..."

"What do you do with them?"

"What do we do? We work. We try to reeducate them, to accustom them to work and to think that man's business is to build rather than destroy. Some -- and we do have them here -- we teach to wash themselves, to sleep in sheets, to change their underclothes once a week, and to use a spoon."

It gradually became clear to me in conversation with the deputy political officer that the corrective-educative process consists of three interlocking factors: Productive labor, the regime, and political education work.

Thus, productive work is socially useful. There are several shops in the work zone. One assembles "Smena" cameras, another -- a turning shop -- produces nuts and bolts, another -- a forging shop -- turns ingots into billets... It is strenuous, basically conveyor belt work, carrying out the same operation 8 hours every day, with Sunday off.

"Aleksandr Aleksandrovich," I asked Captain Sukalo, "have you tried to change the teams carrying out the operations? You could then organize an assembly work competition..."

"We have not, we have a plan and must meet it."

"What comes first for you, then, the plan or education?"

"For me, it is education, but the plan is law, and the leadership considers that there is no point in our experimenting."

"But what do you think?"

"Off the record?.. Or even on the record! I think that without competition the boys turn into automatons, they forget how to think. I personally am certain that an interest in creation is alive in every one of these young boys here who has fallen by the wayside. Therefore, as I see it, the production plan in our establishment should be a special one, the main thing being to develop a taste for conscious labor in the boys.

"So we remonstrate with the foremen and demand that they use the work to educate... But can it really be called education through labor when someone throughout his work stint, day in day out, twists the same old bolt and is unable to raise his head -- you have to keep up with the conveyor belt."

This is what I heard from one of the charges. I read his name off the tag sewn on his chest pocket, but he asked me "not to divulge it"... "I would arrange" he suggested, "a quarterly competition for the best lathe operator, forge worker, or assembly worker, with the winner receiving a pie. The winner of the competition over the year would receive some remission of sentence."

Further, the gist of his argument was that the meaning of punishment is not to be measured in the number of months spent behind bars but in the quality of thinking and rethinking carried out by those convicted. Surely the task of the labor, then, is to turn the thoughts of a thief into the thoughts -- and do not be afraid of the lofty word -- a creator?!

In the office of one of the detachments I spoke with Volodya Alashkin. He was due to leave the camp the next day, a camp where he had spent 18 far from the best months of his 18 years.

"Where are you off to now? The army?" -- I asked him.

"They won't take me," he sighed. "They won't take us until our sentence is complete. I have been freed on parole..."

But why, I asked myself, the boy is considered to have fully acknowledged his guilt, he has served his punishment and managed to demonstrate his civic fitness to rigorous educators in the difficult conditions of a corrective-labor camp. [paragraph continues]

The boy is returning to life, to people, and wants to assume the burden of responsibility, he wants to serve, to be on a par with those of his generation, but is unable to. Some kind of half-trust seems to be operating. But if he is a citizen enjoying full rights again, if every morning he walks alongside us to work, we ought to trust him...

They are thinking of sending Sergey, the one who stole the Kama truck, to some national economic construction projects, to a chemical plant. But does this not mean that those who have put so much effort into his recovery will themselves be delivering him up to those capable of "reeducating" him in the opposite direction?

At his age, after all, he should go into the army, into a solid, healthy collective of people of his own age.

Now about the regime, the second factor after labor. Reveille, stand down, the procession to work, meal times... Detailing of fatiguemen and sanitary orderlies in the quarters... The instructions read: "It is the aim of the convict collective to carry out the regulations pertaining to detention in a well-organized manner..."

Really? I had thought that the aim was social adaptation and preparation for a normal life in society. And the regime is certainly required to promote that.

"Correct, on the whole," Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Ivanovich Zhukov, the camp chief, said in agreement with me, "but that is, so to speak, a long-term desired goal while the actual process is continued in that formulation..."

I have no intention of criticizing the instructions governing the way people live in the camp. But there is, nevertheless, much in the existing wording that is enigmatic and unclear. It is unclear, for example, how it is possible, while preaching that the regime is law, to order the charges to work on their day off in order to meet the plan. It is unclear after this what sort of arguments can be adduced to defend the regulations as law other than shouts and orders. It is unclear how infectious diseases, and very serious ones, could occur in a camp with such strict -- at first sight -- observance of cleanliness and hygiene.

It turns out that the regulations exist for their own sake.

"How can this be so?" I asked Captain Sukalo. "After all, you have said that your work must become part of the labor process and the regime."

"That remains my opinion!" the captain said, despairingly. "There are instruction here for everything. For literally every move you make. Formality is all pervasive. And because I wear shoulder boards, I cannot object to them, but must carry them out. I am indeed told in these terms: You did not introduce them, it is not for you to break them. But they were introduced ages ago, and have been shown up umpteen times.

"In general, while the charges have officers as educators, that is to say, people who wear shoulder boards, nothing will change. The educator must be free from the instructions, since his work is creative. Shoulder boards formalize my relations with the charges and erect a barrier between us. That is alright for those who in the prisoners' eyes symbolize their lack of freedom -- the guards, sentries, and inspectors at the control point. But it should not be so with the people authorized to enter the zone and mix with the charges! [paragraph continues]

Human contact, not orders, should be the main thing inside the zone. The regime would then be clear and would promote education... I have spoken to conferences and faculties countless times. I even wrote a dissertation on this. But I am told: You are a civilian here, you came here after your studies at the institute and understand nothing about our life. Go and work as you are told..."

For me, a newcomer, unfamiliar with the order of relations between "superior" and subordinates, it is somewhat unclear to me how pedagogical truths and sensible ideas geared toward achieving the desired result on the part of educators here in the camp could seemingly be in conflict with a superior's instructions. Or are the "superiors" not educators? Why then are they in a children's corrective labor camp? And I remembered a conversation I had just before leaving the camp with Colonel Aleksandrovich Mikhaylovich Sedov, chief of the Leningrad Oblispolkom Main Internal Affairs Administration Corrective Labor Administration's Political Department.

"We are, after all," he explained, "a state within a state, as it were. We are fully self-sufficient, pay for our own repair, construction work, and equipment. We are virtually independent of everyone. We can live independently. The work here is, of course, strenuous, difficult, and sometimes monotonous, even unpleasant. But, forgive us for saying so, what we have here is a prison, not a health resort. We didn't invite anyone to come behind the barbed wire. All the talk about conditions therefore is demagoguery. Our charges are criminals. Criminals who have been justly convicted, and they are aware of that." Aleksandr Mikhaylovich stressed again, "We are a state within a state. I would begin by making our service separate, independent of city authorities. A great deal of power has already been given to civil officials in the soviets. They stick their noses into our specialized service while understanding little about it. In my opinion, restructuring in the system of corrective-labor establishments should begin with their being removed from the responsibility of the local soviets and put directly under the Ministry of Internal Affairs, which we come under in terms of service..."

"And," I said, continuing his train of thought, "completely denying the public access to matters inside the establishment..."

"Why 'completely'!" -- the colonel objected. "Let people come, let amateur groups perform, let Komsomol members, internationalist servicemen... But why let people pry into what they do not understand, after all?"

I then had one more conversation, with Vladimir Timofeyevich Lisovskiy, a professor at Leningrad University, a doctor of psychology and noted specialist in the problems of young people.

In his opinion, the position of the educator in the camp is a purely formal. The officer rank automatically implies subordination on the part of others. However, the very point is that the charges are not subordinates, the charges are people undergoing education! It is no use putting them in the "front-line," no use shouting orders at them. They have to be worked with in the manner of a teacher. That is important for every staffer at a camp -- from chief to inspector.

In general, the point is that there should be no orders at all in a children's educational establishment. Children find it difficult to understand the logic of an order and mostly fail to grasp it at all. They do grasp the logic of contact. Only via contact is it possible to reach a child's sensibility, particularly the sensibility of a young boy or girl gripped with fear or the trauma of having sinned, if one may use that concept. [paragraph continues]

Perhaps it is right that Makarenko should not be in the military and his camp not belong to the internal services system? Perhaps we were mistaken in transferring the camp to it from the public educational system? Perhaps it should be returned? And highly qualified teachers should be concerned with questions of the civic ethos of their charges and questions of their labor education." Perhaps such restructuring should be proposed to Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Sedov instead of what he proposes? That is to say, the converse: Opening up to the maximum extent of our childrens' corrective-labor camps for future civic life...

But meanwhile... in the camp, in the shop where cameras with the promising name of "Smena" are assembled, the monotonous pace of life is set by the conveyor belt. Plans for educational work continue to be drawn up, conferences held, and reports... delivered. But perhaps all this is mere illusion? And there is no corrective-labor colony, but just a place of imprisonment where children are detained?

VOSTRUKHOV NOTES WESTERN VIEW OF SOVIET HIJACKER

PM171111 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 August 1987 Morning Edition carries on page 4 under the "Details for IZVESTIYA" rubric and the headline "Angel of Stall" a 2,000-word undated report by own correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov from the Latvian SSR which begins as follows:

"As has already been reported (IZVESTIYA No. 150), an AN-2 aircraft was stolen and taken to Sweden by a certain Svistunov, who was dismissed from Aeroflot 2 years ago after refusing to pay a large debt. The dismissed pilot was hiding from his creditors in Nikolayev and managed to steal an aircraft from the Latvian town of Saldus. Readers, who reacted to this incident whith hundreds of letters, are demanding that we describe how it happened."

The report first describes how Svistunov stole the biplane by posing as a replacement technician and then digresses to give an account of his training and previous experience as a pilot. Returning to his description of the theft, Vostrukhov points out that the biplane crew commander Sidorenko was guilty of leaving the plane with its keys unattended and with more fuel than specified by instructions and criticizes the crew for accepting Svistunov's unauthorized presence on the runway and among civil aviation personnel.

The report notes that the incident was "thoroughly investigated" with the participation of representatives of the Ministry of Civil Aviation at the Latvian SSR Civil Aviation Administration and at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee bureau. "All those guilty of professional inadequacy have been strictly punished through party and administrative channels," Vostrukhov states. Finally he gives a brief account of Svistunov's delinquent past. He concludes:

"How was the criminal offender Svistunov presented in broadcasts by various Western radio voices? You have guessed, of course: as a 'fighter for human rights' -- no more no less. What's truth got to do with it? As long as it's said as loudly as possible..."

AGANBEGYAN INTERVIEWED ON RESTRUCTURING

AU141200 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 12 Aug 87 p 6

["Interview with Academician Abel Aganbegyan, secretary of the Economics Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences," by Atanas Atanasov, RABOTNICHESKO DELO Moscow correspondent, in Moscow — date not given]

[Text] My interview with the well-known Soviet economist took place in his office at the institute in Krasikova Street in Moscow, exactly 32 days before his departure for Bulgaria, where he planned to spend his holiday. That is why our talk started with a question that will certainly be among the first topics of conversation with his colleagues and friends in Bulgaria: namely the progress of the restructuring process in the USSR in the light of the decisions adopted at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum.

The academician pointed out the following in this connection: For me and many of my colleagues who have long advocated the idea of radical restructuring in the economic mechanism and the idea of a transition from administrative methods to economic leadership and management methods at all levels, the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum went beyond even our boldest expectations. Who could have assumed, 2 and a half years ago, that the enterprises would be given infinitely greater independence than we expected and the opportunity to plan their own work. Who could have assumed that even the figures "handed down from above" would not be compulsory, or that the "curses" against commodity-monetary relations would stop and that these relations would be treated as they deserve to be. If I had told someone that radical reforms of prices, of the financial-credit system, of material-technical supplies, and so forth, would be introduced in 1987, people would have called me naive at best.

[Atanasov] Comrade Aganbegyan, people usually say that restructuring is a difficult process which is still in its initial phase. Could you sum up the achievements in the present stage of development?

[Aganbegyan] There is no question that restructuring is a complicated, controversial, and hence, painful and prolonged process, still in its very early stages. This is so because the problem involves not half-measures, palliative improvements to an already outdated administrative-bureaucratic economic system, but the replacement of this system by a basically different mechanism, organically adapted to contemporary scientific-technical progress.

There can be no doubt that the results so far are positive and inspire us with optimism. The chief argument for this can be described as follows: The understanding that it is no longer possible to live and work in the old way now prevails in our society today. We are aware of the fact that extensive and radical changes are required. Hence the increasing interest and social activity of the workers class and of the working people in implementing revolutionary changes in all sectors in our country. How otherwise can we explain the stabilizing trend toward the acceleration of socioeconomic development and the improvement of quality indexes? Or, the intensive innovation of the material-technical potential of our economy, which has been initiated in accordance with the reorienting of production toward quality, and of our investment policy.

[Atanasov] As for the working people's opinions published in the mass media, along with the optimism expressed, we can also observe certain doubts in the sense that real restructuring is still more intensely felt in the pages of the press and in television programs, on the stage, and in literary magazines, than in real life....

[Aganbegyan] I fully agree with the second part of this statement. It is quite logical, since the mass media are the most active promoters of glasnost as a result and condition of the democratization of society. The doubts are natural and understandable. The fact that they are not always justified is another matter. Observing things from the side, it is really not possible to grasp the scope and dimensions of the changes that are occurring in the restructuring process. I might cite, for example, the scientific research, and the practical experiments implemented along with it, the most careful study of the socialist countries' experience. All these achievements were the result of gigantic efforts by numerous groups of scientists, party workers, and specialists over a period of 2 years, which was crowned by specific, but I would like to emphasize, "invisible," successes and final results. We already have not only a scientifically founded, comprehensive concept of the new economic mechanism, but also a reliable set of instruments without which a total restructuring of economic management is unthinkable. It is sufficient to recall the Law on State Enterprise (Trust) and the 11 other decrees which establish the approaches and methods of changes in various spheres and at various levels.

Or let us take an aspect that illustrates the complicated nature of this process and the contradictions existing within it, at the same time explaining why, at the beginning of its third year, it is still in its initial stage. Restructuring requires an essential redistribution of rights and responsibilities; it makes it necessary to take numerous rights from the ministries and other functional organs and transfer them to the basic production units -- such as enterprises and economic trusts. However, this "operation," which appears automatic at first glance, actually represents a complicated and prolonged struggle between the old and the new elements. By no means are all members of the aforementioned apparatus willing to part with their former rights, which guaranteed their social prestige and other privileges. On the other hand, by no means are all economic leaders ready to assume these rights, because they involve greater demands and greater responsibilities.

[Atanasov] Discussions about the shortcomings of the old economic mechanism made the expression "diktat of the producer over the consumer" quite popular. Could you be so kind as to dwell on these mutual relations?

[Aganbegyan] You are talking about the most serious organic shortcoming of the old economic mechanism, under which the core of planning was represented by the notorious total output index, measured in metric tons, in meters, in units, and volume of goods calculated in depersonalized [obezlicheni] rubles. This index, which was established in the past under conditions of a general shortage of material resources, later developed into the "dictatorship" of the producer and into the primary cause of the wasteful economy ("the more expensive -- the better"). Under the old planning system everything required for production was determined and granted "from above" according to preliminary applications submitted at least a year and a half in advance. It is understandable that these circumstances the producers struggled to "obtain" as many financial and raw material resources as possible for "any possible emergency"....

Some people might say: "So what, this is a trifle." Nevertheless, this instinctive striving became a constant source of tremendous losses for the national economy. I can cite some specific data to illustrate the situation and draw attention to it. Thus, for example, in the 1960-85 period the gross national income of the USSR increased 3.8 percent, while commodity-material reserves increased 6.2 times. This means that material resources worth hundreds of billions of rubles were taken out of economic circulation and "frozen". It is sufficient to point out that excess reserves worth approximately R460 billion have now been built up in the national economy, exceeding the amount of the country's annual national income.

[Atanasov] For the ordinary consumer, concepts such as "excess reserves" and "frozen funds" are abstract terms. However, he is constantly subjected to the diktat of the producers, because he is being deprived of rights.

[Aganbegyan] You have anticipated my thoughts. I am going to say that this system, above all, corrupts the producer because it places him in a monopolistic position and subsequently determines in advance his relations with the consumer under the philosophic concept: "Grab what you can get!" Since the producer is not interested in the taste and demands of the consumer, he actually forces the consumer to accept goods which are of no use to anyone. This is how we reached a situation in which certain goods are redundant, while others are in short supply.

[Atanasov] Could you cite a specific example of this?

[Aganbegyan] There are numerous such examples. In 1987, for example, the Soviet Union will produce approximately 800 million pairs of shoes, which is 3.2 pairs per capita. Let us make a comparison. In the CSSR the output is 1.7 pairs per capita, while in the United States 1.3 per capita are produced. Nevertheless, in those countries the number of shoes produced is sufficient, while in our country shoes are in short supply. This shortage, however, means that there are not enough beautiful, comfortable, and fashionable shoes, while a large amount of substandard shoes are produced in excess, and these remain unsold and freeze millions of rubles that should have been in circulation in the warehouses of the respective shops.

We could cite many such examples in the case of machines, equipment, and raw materials. As absurd as it may sound, these examples are in conformity with the logic of the shortage economy, which involves the total separation of production from the needs of society. That is why the basic goal of restructuring and the primary function of our new economic mechanism is to strengthen the priority role of the consumer. To put it in other words: we must eliminate the diktat of the producer and simultaneously do away with the shortages that represent the harmful converse of efficiency in production.

Second Part of Interview

AU151625 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 13 Aug 87 p 4

[Continuation of interview with Academician Abel Aganbegyan, secretary of the Economics Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, by Atanas Atanasov, RABOTNICHESKO DELO correspondent in Moscow. "No Half-Measures, but Radical Changes"; exact date of interview not given; first two paragraphs are Atanasov's introduction]

[Text] The concepts "restructuring" and "acceleration" are accepted by the majority mechanically, without thinking, and mostly in a quantitative sense. During the 11th 5-Year Plan period national income rose by 3 percent, whereas during the present 12th 5-Year Plan period an increase of at least 4 percent is provided for, and during the 1990's we must exceed 5 percent. Of course, the quantitative aspect of progress is extremely important, but the chief thing at the present stage is the qualitative content of the growth, that is, what equipment and technologies are used to attain the growth, what products are obtained, what needs are met, and so on...

I reminded Academician Aganbegyan of this idea from his published work, as a ground for asking my next question, which concerned the important subject of the human factor:

[Atanasov] The revolutionary reforms in Soviet society programmed by the 27th CPSU Congress depend on the people, and primarily on their daily labor, be it in the minister's office or the factory, in the scientific laboratory or in the fields. What is being done to improve the quality of this labor in all its aspects, since this in the final event will also predetermine the radical qualitative changes in the development of the economy and society?

[Aganbegyan] I would have posed the question differently, like this: How are the workers' personal interests being more intimately identified with public interests? In what way is their interest to be aroused in working dedicatedly and with initiative, so to speak, as if for themselves? There are many unresolved problems in this respect, because under the economic and psychological conditions of the administrative mechanism of management many people simply lost the habit of working properly, and their "sacred" principles of the past, namely conscientiousness, enterprise, and respect for top-grade work, became undermined.

The main levers of the old system were directives, prohibitions, and appeals. These are now giving way to a powerful system of motivations and incentives that affect, in the same way, the interests of the individual worker, the collective, and society. The task is to consolidate the interdependence of the results of the enterprise's activity and the size of the wages fund and the fund for social and cultural needs. The collective will now be able to earn money for these purposes. Or, as some say: "Now there are no more jobs for a fixed wage, but there will be a wage for the work completed."

Another fundamental feature is this: Organizational and economic preconditions are being created to eliminate the practice of reducing everyone to the same level [uravnilovka] and, at the same time, to develop a well-founded differentiation in wages, that naturally depends on the quantity and quality of the end production result. This differentiation is not limited by any upper limit whatsoever. Thus personal interest in working is mobilized, with a full display of individual skill, talent, and creative energy, because labor is rewarded justly, in full accordance with the socialist principle "to each according to his abilities and what he has produced."

It is also of importance that the planning of the wages fund through directives is being replaced by economic regulations established for 5 years ahead. In contrast to the previous practice, savings in the wages fund are not taken away, but stay in the enterprise, without affecting the plan for the following year. It is self-evident that these savings may be obtained due to highly efficient and high-quality labor, and that they will be used for additional supplements to the wage rates, payments, and bonuses.

[Atanasov] Given the position that the upper limit for wages is eliminated, how do you view the further development of family and individual piecework in agriculture and of the small-scale forms of cooperative and individual work, especially when one bears in mind that their socialist nature is no longer being placed in doubt?

[Aganbegyan] The spread of these organizational forms still meets with twisted interpretations of their essential nature, but there is no road back, and from now on their possibilities will be utilized. The effectiveness of family piecework, long known in Bulgaria and other socialist countries, has been tested by us in most of the union republics. Its further application on a mass scale in the cultivation of labor-intensive crops and livestock farming is a matter of initiative and organization. I might say the same about the collectives of agricultural machinery operators for intensive labor. The first groups started work 2 years ago on a "scenario" planned by scientists suitable for the specific conditions of Novosibirskaya Oblast. Their successors already number in the thousands.

The primary ground for the favorable prospects for these forms is the fact that they are advantageous for both the people and the economy. In places where they are applied skillfully, based on agreements that precisely specify each side's obligations, the results exceed our expectations. It is not merely a question of obtaining better production results. These forms happily combine the interests of the kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers with concern for the land, animals, and other means of production entrusted to them, and give rise to and strengthen their feeling of being good managers.

[Atanasov] Voices can be heard saying about these people: "They are receiving far too much..."

[Aganbegyan] No, they aren't "receiving," but earning a higher remuneration, and this is fair. On this topic the July Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee declared: "Good luck to them!"

[Atanasov] Comrade Aganbegyan, let us view the obverse side of the problem of material interestedness: There is no doubt that people will work better and receive more, but surely the money earned is not the end purpose?

[Aganbegyan] Yes, the money earned must continue to circulate and to be utilized to meet the various needs of the population. The more dynamic the circulation of this money, the better it will be for the national economy and society as a whole. In this manner, the end result will be that the material interest of the people will be harnessed in practice. However, when a man is unable to find what he is looking for, he tends to buy whatever he comes across, or to keep the money at home or put it in his savings bank account. If this situation continues for a long time, one can speak of a disparity between the demand fueled by purchasing power and the covering of this demand with goods. [paragraph continues]

The Soviet people's savings are now reaching R4 billion. This figure is very large and is an indication of certain failures in the market, of a devaluation of the ruble. Yet the negative consequences of the phenomenon on people's material interests are even more significant. This creates ground for the philosophy: Why should I work and try harder, if I cannot get for myself what I like with the money that I earn? This is why one of the priority tasks in the current 5-year plan is to achieve a quantitative and qualitative increase in the different forms of services to the population and the production of consumer goods that is higher than the average increase for industry.

MINISTER OUTLINES PROBLEMS IN MACHINE BUILDING

PM141333 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 8 Aug 87 p 1

[Article by N. Panichev, minister of machine tool and tool building industry: "Hard Going on the Road to a Breakthrough"]

[Text] The intense, I would even say passionate, interest currently being shown in our sector is perfectly understandable. "The 'holy of holies' of technical progress" is what M.S. Gorbachev called machine tool building at the recent conference at the CPSU Central Committee. The technical standard of the equipment we produce today determines the future technological standard of the entire machine building complex. Hiccups in machine building have repeatedly affected the rate of technical progress in the country's national economy. That is why we are currently hearing such severe criticism, that is why our customers' strictures are particularly acute. Retooling is taking place in all sectors, everyone needs modern machine tools, automatic lines, and flexible production modules. And we are not meeting these needs at the moment.

Certainly, the sector headquarters is seriously alarmed by the situation. We have carried out a critical analysis of its causes and above all of our own errors and faults. And they are not exactly small. Painful though it is to admit it, it has to be frankly stated that our main problem is that for a long time we deluded ourselves with an imaginary prosperity and saw success where there was none. This was promoted by the fact that the criteria for assessing the technical standard of products were misplaced through the fault of our sector science. Our designers essentially ignored very important parameters such as the metal- and energy-intensiveness of equipment, its reliability, and automation and tooling level. A study of progressive metalworking and forging and pressing equipment revealed that we had fallen short of world standards in terms of these particular performance indicators.

We had to revise the 5-year plan that had already been elaborated, make fundamental amendments to the structure of output, and take steps to improve its technical standard. These amendments were incorporated in the targets for the end of the 5-year plan: The proportion of very important products on a par with world standards is to rise from 14 percent in 1986 to 86 percent in 1990. It is envisaged that production of manually controlled machine tools will be reduced by 30,000 units and production of automatic devices, machine tools with digital program control, processing centers, automatic, rotary, and rotary conveyor lines, and other types of progressive equipment will increase several times over. In other words, in this 5-year plan we are to lay the foundation for a radical change in the structure of the machine tool pool in machine building.

In order to reach this target, the comprehensive sectorial programs "Reliability," "Quality," and "Technical Standard" have been elaborated and approved. All enterprises have specific targets. But not everything was accomplished in the first 18 months of the 5-year plan. The sector as a whole and many enterprises were unprepared for work in the new, more complex conditions where there has been a sharp increase in the output of high technology products and demands on the technical standard, quality, and quicker renewal of products have increased. Our omissions in introducing state acceptance at 115 enterprises in the sector and tightening up quality control in places where it is not yet operating were particularly apparent. There was a considerable increase in labor-intensiveness and there was an increase in the time taken to test finished products. As a result the machine tool manufacturing cycle, depending on complexity, was extended by 2-50 working shifts.

Hence the results of economic activity. There was a marked deterioration in the first half of this year. Targets for labor productivity, profits, and increased production volume and contract pledges were not fulfilled. Customers were fully supplied with only 5 of the 18 items on the main list. Targets for new equipment were not fulfilled. Naturally, all this affected the financial status of enterprises and made it harder for them to prepare for the switch to economic accountability and self-financing.

What is being done today to get the sector out of its hiccup phase? We are perfectly well aware that ongoing interference in enterprises' activity and specific assistance on individual matters will not bring long-term success. It is necessary to quickly restructure work style and methods both in labor collectives and in the sector headquarters and make full use of economic management levers. The number one task is to learn economic accountability. And everyone must learn it -- work teams, plant and association specialists and leaders, and ministry personnel. Training has now been organized in the sector. The economic normatives have nearly been finalized in conjunction with enterprises.

In order to achieve a fundamental breakthrough in the creation of competitive, world-class equipment we are stepping up the integration of science and production. Of the 106 scientific research institutes and design bureaus 93 have already become members of science and production associations. Three large science and production associations have been organized: "VNIILITMASH," "VNIIALMAZ," and "VNIIZMERENIYA," in which the creation of equipment goes from scientific studies to series production. To carry out the comprehensive planning of industrial facilities and retooling of existing enterprises we have set up the "Orgstankinprom" Science and Production Association, which is made up of planning and technological institutes and their branches. We are continuing work on the restructuring of sectorial science: We are carefully analyzing the activities of its subunits, regrouping them, identifying and eliminating the inefficient ones, and setting up centers for specialized areas of activity. I believe that by the end of the year all the institutes will be ready to switch to economic accountability.

At the same time, in view of the ministries; new functions, defined by the CPSU Central Committee June Plenum, we are creating a new sector management structure. Proposals have been prepared which provide for the complete reorganization of existing subunits. We are strengthening technical and economic services and production specialization and sharing services. This will enable us to concentrate the efforts of the sector headquarters on the chief areas of scientific and technical progress, bring about an improvement in the technical standard and quality of enterprises' products, and introduce economic methods of management. Using the experience we and other sectors have accumulated, we are embarking on the creation of state production associations which will help to further concentrate production and improve management.

But measures of another kind are needed in order to achieve a clear breakthrough in machine tool building. Our problem is that because of serious errors in investment policy over several 5-year plans and the orientation chiefly toward the purchase of imported equipment, the development of the production and technical potential of the key machine building sector has fallen behind modern demands. Suffice it to say that during the 11th 5-Year Plan the proportion of machine tool and tool building industry production capital in overall machine building capital decreased by one percent. There was also a reduction in the proportion of capital investments.

The state of equipment is causing particular anxiety. Nearly one-half of the pool of metal-cutting machine tools at our enterprises falls short of present-day standards and should be removed from the shops. But we are regularly allocated 30-35 percent less equipment than we request for renewal purposes. At the start of the current 5-year plan the machine tool builders were in the position of a "shoemaker without shoes." It is particularly difficult for heavy machine tool and press building enterprises, which mainly use custom-made equipment, and also for enterprises making precision machine tools.

So what is the solution? In the present 5-year plan we are using more than one-half of our allotment of capital investments for retooling. We are planning to renew approximately 67 percent of the active part of fixed capital. But to do this we must be able to keep the majority of processing centers and grinders our enterprises produce this year and next. Then, by removing the old and obsolete equipment from the shops, we will reduce the machine tool pool by one-third and increase the machine shift coefficient. The main thing is that we will be able to sharply improve the technological standard of our enterprises in order to ensure the output of high-quality modern products.

The radical improvement of the technical standard of products depends to a large extent on the quality of components and materials. Unfortunately, for many years we have experienced a shortage of highly reliable, modern electronic control systems and of electrical goods. The measures outlined in conjunction with supply ministries are being implemented very slowly. That is why, taking into account the experience of world machine tool building, the sector is setting up its own scientific and production base for the production of complete control systems, primarily for heavy and custom machine tools and special equipment.

I would like to note that, despite the complex and difficult situation in the sector, the collectives of our enterprises have managed since the start of the 5-year plan to create some groundwork in terms of new equipment. Some 325 prototypes and 194 trial batches of production equipment have been manufactured to a high technical standard. Some 84 of these models have gone into industrial production. Some 220 obsolete models have been withdrawn from production. The proportion of products meeting world standards is now 39 percent. This means that real steps have been taken toward the targets set for the end of the 5-year plan.

Concentrating efforts in the main spheres of scientific and technical progress, strengthening the enterprise's material base, and restructuring in management and cadre policy and in work methods will make it possible to achieve the breakthrough that is so essential in the machine tool and instrument industry.

JAN-JUL INDUSTRIAL PERFORMANCE ASSESSED

PM141205 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 12 Aug 87 p 1

[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA Economy and Propaganda Department report under the rubric "Summing Up Results -- July": "Output Strictly to Order"]

[Text] According to the USSR State Committee for Statistics, the increase in industrial output over the past 7 months is in line with the plan targets for the current period of the year.

However, today attention is focused not on output in general, but on output requested by specific clients and made and dispatched on time. This is reflected in the indicator for the fulfillment of contract commitments. In the January-July period in industry as a whole it totals 98.4 percent. That is a slight improvement on the 6-month figures.

The fuel and energy complex worked steadily on the whole in July. The targets for the extraction and production of the most important types of fuel and energy resources were met, including in the coal industry. However, one in two enterprises in this sector still has a debt to consumers. Oilmen have virtually eliminated the shortfall which had built up since the beginning of the year. However, they still have problems with certain oil extraction associations. The "Varyeganneftegaz" 7-month results, for instance, show that it has a shortfall of 1.3 million tonnes of oil against the plan. Let us note that this is more than one-third of the above-target output (3.4 million tonnes, including gas condensate) achieved through the tremendous efforts of collectives in the sector as a whole.

In the metallurgical complex, where targets for the production of basic output are being met quite successfully, there is nonetheless a shortfall in the production of progressive types of metal output. The situation is particularly alarming with regard to the fulfillment of orders for electric steel, cold-rolled sheet, and some other items.

Machine building collectives are taking steps to accelerate the renewal of their own production potential so that they can better satisfy the need for new equipment in other sectors. However, they have not yet succeeded in eliminating the shortfall built up since the beginning of the year. Enterprises within this complex have still not achieved the preferential rate of development planned for the current 5-year plan. This is borne out, in particular, also by the fact that the increase in output is smaller than in industry as a whole (2.8 as against 3.5 percent).

The 24 July CPSU Central Committee conference clearly specified what the machine builders must do at the present stage of restructuring. The necessary state assistance is guaranteed to them. However, it is also necessary to step up exactingness regarding the results of economic management in every collective.

In the chemical and timber complex the situation is currently being complicated by enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, a ministry which until recently was a cause of joy in view of its steady performance. Now a debt to consumers is building up as a result of failure to meet production targets for almost all the key types of output, including commercial and sawn timber, pulp, and paper. In the chemical industry, too, there is a shortfall. Interruptions in the deliveries of new types of output and household chemicals are causing particular concern. Equipment, including imported equipment, at the Zimino chemical plant, the Syzran "Plastik" Association, and some other enterprises is not working at full capacity.

The construction complex industry is fulfilling consumers' orders quite well on the whole. However, here too the planned production targets for certain types of materials, especially soft roofing materials and window panes, are not being met.

The stocking of the market in line with the demands of trade is continuing. However, the situation relating to consumer durables is causing concern. Not enough television sets, radio equipment, refrigerators, and freezers are being produced. And most importantly, their quality remains low. According to statistical information relating to the RSFSR, justified complaints to manufacturers are made in the case of 3 out of 5 color television sets, almost 1 in 4 tape-recorders, and 1 in 10 automatic washing machines. The elimination of the defects is very costly. In the case of the aforementioned television sets it totals one-tenth, and in the case of cameras one-fifth of the cost of the repaired goods.

Restructuring has had a tangible impact on the main supplier of nonfood goods -- light industry. The fulfillment of delivery targets is somewhat higher here than in industry as a whole and totals 98.6 percent. However, here too it is necessary to persistently improve output quality.

Enterprises' profits will depend to a decisive degree on the fulfillment of their contract commitments. During the first half of the year labor collectives in machine building and the chemical and timber complex and industrial enterprises of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee have obtained smaller profits than planned.

BRIEFS

ARCTIC OIL FIELD -- Murmansk August 14 TASS -- The first tanker with a load of oil today left the country's northernmost oil field in the Barents Sea as the field's commercial operation started. The Peschano-Ozersk oil field in the vicinity of the island of Kolguyev required several years of strenuous effort on the part of geological prospectors who had to work in the harsh conditions of the extreme north to make the field operational. Drilling equipment, derricks, machinery and parts of houses had to be shipped to the field by sea, using natural ice floes for wharves. Oil prospecting is being continued off Kolguyev Island. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 14 Aug 87 LD]

SOVIET-LED RESEARCHERS SYNTHESIZE NEW ELEMENT

LD182258 Moscow TASS in English 2245 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Moscow August 17 TASS -- The 110th element of the Mendelyev periodic table in which all elements are placed in the order of growth of their atomic weights has been synthesized at the Joint Institute for Nuclear Research of Dubna (Moscow region). The two-year research project carried out by an international staff of scientists, engineers and workmen led by Professor Yuriy Oganesyan ended in a success. Specialists from the U.S.S.R., France, the German Democratic Republic and Romania took part in the project.

Researchers at the institute told a TASS correspondent that the new element had been obtained as a result of the bombardment of thorium and of uranium isotopes by a heavy-duty beam of accelerated calcium and argon nuclei. That non-traditional technique of synthesizing a new element was proposed by Academician Georgiy Fleriv, although physicists in the U.S. and West Germany regarded it as not very promising.

The work was conducted on the u-400 cyclotron which can produce nuclei beams of the intensity exceeding several times the summed intensity of all other similar accelerators existing in the world.

During the experiment the researchers had to resolve a host of complicated scientific and engineering problems. For instance, they found efficient means for removing the background formed by the nuclei of lighter elements produced in side reactions and made it difficult to detect the 110th element.

In order to register the formation and disintegration of its individual atoms the researchers used extremely sensitive equipment, fine physical, chemical and radiochemical methods. A total of 40 nuclei of the 110th element were obtained. They exist for about one-hundredth of a second. Physicists are of the opinion that it is a very long life for the element that heavy.

"The findings provide fresh evidence in favor of the existence of a so-called island of super-heavy elements possessing high stability to radioactive decay," Academician Flerov said. "According to the current theories, such an 'island' exists in the area of the elements with atomic numbers from 110 to 114. The results discovered in the search for the 110th element are especially important inasmuch as they open a way toward the synthesis of even heavier elements. Experiments related to the synthesis of the 111th element have already started at Dubna."

BRIEFS

ALMA-ATA SEISMIC STATION -- The country's finest bioseismic test station has been established in the Zailiyskiy Alatau ranges near Alma-Ata. It is located in a seismically unstable area, and domestic fowl and other animals brought to the station will be studied for behavior patterns predicting seismic activity from 40 days to several hours in advance. Seismologists will use the animals as seismic data indicators. Equipment installed in direct proximity to the animal shelters and recording equipment will correlate seismic activity and animal behavior. [Summary] [Moscow Television Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Aug 87 OW]

AIR FLEET DAY MARKED BY DISPLAYS, SPEECHES

Officials Attend Air Show

LD161621 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Aug 87

[Text] The air show that took place today on USSR Air Fleet Day in Tushino, took the form of a vivid demonstration of the achievements of Soviet aircraft construction and the great mastery in sport of the airmen, glider-pilots, and parachutists. This year the air show is devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the 60th anniversary of Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy of the USSR.

In the central stand were Comrades Nikonov, Slyunkov, Chebrikov, Yeltsin, Yazov, and Biryukova. Among the guests there were Heng Samrin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the National Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea and president of the Council of State of the People's Republic of Kampuchea. Also attending the celebrations were the heads of ministries and departments, eminent military commanders, and representatives of party, local soviet, and public organizations.

Yefimov Addresses Meeting

PM171323 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Aug 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Honor of the Holiday"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of the capital's public and Moscow garrison servicemen to mark USSR Air Fleet Day was held in Moscow 14 August.

In the presidium were Yu.D. Maslyukov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.S. Belyakov, chief of a CPSU Central Committee department; the leaders of a number of ministries and departments; and representatives of party, soviet, and social organizations.

Speaking at the meeting, Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister, stressed that military pilots in a unified combat formation with servicemen of other branches of the Soviet Armed Forces and Warsaw Pact states' armies will continue to reliably protect the gains of socialism and are always ready to carry out any order from the motherland.

Yefimov Delivers Speech

LD161856 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1345 GMT 16 Aug 87

[Speech by Marshal of Aviation Aleksandr Yefimov, commander in chief of the USSR Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister, on the occasion of USSR Air Force Day; video shows Yefimov seated at a desk -- live or recorded]

[Text] Dear comrades, USSR Air Force Day has entered our life as a bright festival and a chance to review the achievements of all pilots, both those who develop and train others to fly and those who, behind their controls, are carrying out their combat and labor watch in the blue expanses of the sky, and are assaulting records in sporting battles below the clouds.

Born in the threatening days of the October Revolution, the country's Air Force traversed a glorious combat and labor path, and honorably fulfilled its historic destiny.

In keeping with the perspicacious foresight of Vladimir Ilich Lenin, aviation detachments became an important means of armed defense for the socialist motherland. These days, at work in the peaceful skies of the country are mighty ILS and Ruslans, and defending it are all-weather jet aviation complexes equipped with the most refined means for locating and destroying an enemy.

When you look at this mighty technology, your heart is filled with a sense of pride for our countrymen and for our Soviet people. The Soviet Air Force was created under conditions of enormous deprivation and destruction brought about by the civil war and the imperialist intervention. At the call of the party and the Komsomol, inquisitive young people of the proletariat, dedicated to socialism, entered aviation. In a short period, a domestic aviation industry was established in the country. Regular air routes were created. Air clubs and aviation training establishments started to function. Cadres of winged defenders of the motherland were forged. As early as the thirties, the Soviet Union had been transformed into a mighty aviation power.

Aviation provided the first heroes of the Soviet Union. The names of legendary individuals have remained with us all our lives: (Chkalov), (Baydukov), (Belyakov), (Khromov), (Yemashov), and (Danilin).

Recently we marked the 50th anniversary of the outstanding feat of a nonstop flight from Moscow via the North Pole to the United States in single-engined (?AN-25) aircraft. This was a symbol of the bold ascent of the Soviet people. After the crossing flight by Khromov's crew to the United States, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote: For the second time in the course of a few weeks, we have to take our hats off to Russian aviation. All of America applauds it. It is no coincidence that at that time the International Aeronautical Federation for the first time awarded the Soviet pilots silver and bronze De La Vaulx medals. I am speaking of this event in some detail due to the fact that in recent times many of our achievements are being placed in doubt by some people. But it is on such pages of history that Soviet young people are after all educated, and one must not forget them.

The high moral fighting qualities of Soviet pilots were shown in battles with the Japanese samurais, in the sky of Karelia, and in providing international aid to revolutionary Spain, China, and Mongolia.

Among the heroes of such events are the pilots (Rysovets), (Kravchenko), and (Smushkeyevich). The contribution of aviation to achieving victory in the bitter years of the Great Patriotic War is significant. Not a single major combat operation was conducted without the active participation of the Air Force. With strikes at Hitlerite aviation in the air and at aerodromes, they gradually deprived the enemy of his temporary advantages. In the furious battles around Moscow and Stalingrad, in the Kursk salient, the strategic mastery of the air was gained. It was reliably held until the complete routing of fascist Germany.

Ideological conviction, devotion to the Communist Party of the socialist motherland, loyalty to duty, and a burning hatred for the enemy served the pilot fighters as an inexhaustible source of courage, valor, and military prowess. During the war years, in aerial combat and at aerodromes, Soviet pilots destroyed 57,000 Hitlerite aircraft, which amounted to two-thirds of the losses by German aviation on the Soviet-German front. Forever in the people's memory will remain the courageous examples of the heroes (Belousov), (Zdorovets), (Katrysh), (Mare-il), (Safonov), (Khostel), (Taladikhin), (Khravets), and many other brave Soviet eagles.

The whole world learned of the names of the Soviet aces -- the thrice heroes of the Soviet Union (Pokrishkin) and (Kozhdum).

Alongside the pilots of the Air Force, antiaircraft defense, and naval aviation, a weighty contribution to the routing of Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism was made by civil aviation.

In the skies at the front, the combat friendship between Soviet, Polish, Czechoslovakian, and Romanian pilots was born and grew strong. This continues today in the combat ranks of the pilots of the Warsaw Pact countries. And French pilots of the illustrious Normandie-Niemen regiment flew wing to wing with us toward combat tasks.

The Soviet aviation industry, which in the most difficult conditions produced for the front more than 112,000 fighting aircraft worthily passed the examination at that time. One must not keep silent about the mass patriotic movement of our people, its unity and self-sacrifice in the bitter years of the war. The Moscow and Leningrad aviation units rose from factory aerodromes into the air and headed for the front, the Krasniy Proletariy, Uralskiy Rabochiy, Gorkovskiy Somsomolets squadrons, and others.

World War II ended, but it was not quiet in the world. Aggressive imperialist forces did not reconcile themselves to its results and set off along the path of preparing social revenge and of whipping up a new military psychosis in the world. Even today, in the West in NATO countries, especially in the United States, the efforts of reactionary circles to achieve military-strategic superiority over socialism are not weakening, and preparations for a new -- and now a nuclear and space war -- are not slackening. They are provoking conflicts in various regions of the world, as confirmed by the recent events in the Persian Gulf.

Taking into account the bleak reality of our times, the complexity and explosiveness of the international situation, and the way that imperialism lays its stake on force, the CPSU and the Soviet Government, while continuing its peaceful foreign policy, do not pay any less attention to strengthening the country's defense and the combat readiness of the Soviet Armed Forces. In so doing, the Soviet leadership cannot fail to take into account the plans of the United States for a broad increase in air superiority over the USSR, counting on their Air Force as one of the main ways of implementing their conception of neoglobalism and conducting a policy of threats and blackmail.

Drawing their conclusions from the complex military and political situation in the world and the demands of the Soviet military doctrine, the pilots and navigators, and all Air Force personnel, are raising their political vigilance, their level of organization, and their discipline. They are persistently improving their flying and weapon skills, their combat readiness, and are strengthening their interaction with the air defense troops and other branches of the Armed Forces.

The successful solution of the tasks assigned to the Air Force is being helped by the restructuring which has already begun in the style of work of the leading cadres in the spirit of the demands of the party, and more purposeful party and political work. The efforts of the party and Komsomol organizations are aimed at the development of creative initiatives of the flyers, intolerance toward bureaucratic behavior and stagnant phenomena, and toward cliched actions in the solution of combat training tasks. Measures are being taken to make combat training and tactical flying exercises closer to the real conditions of modern battle.

The country is very familiar with the names of aviators from days of peace. They include pilot (Yeliseyev) who carried out the first ram attack in a high-speed jet fighter against a transgressing aircraft; Aviator Major General Antoshkin, who directed the operations of the Air Force pilots in closing down the reactor of the Chernobyl AES. They include too Major (Malyshev) who was presented with the star of a hero for courage and boldness in carrying out his internationalist duty in Afghanistan; and Aviation Captain (Kucharenko), delegate to the 20th congress of the VLKSM and many other worthy representatives of the Air Force.

In the tense working days of the Armed Forces, the aviators grow into men, they are tempered ideologically, they hone their flying skills, taking into account extreme situations in the air. Day and night, in all weathers, they take their machines up to carry out their tasks, guarding the creative labor of the Soviet people.

But it is not in the tradition of the Air Force to be content with what it has achieved. We start out from the belief that there is no limit to the perfection of combat readiness, and indeed the pace of life set by the 27th congress, the criticism made the Soviet Armed Forces at the CPSU Central Committee June plenum in connection with violation of Soviet air space by a West German light plane, do not allow us to work as we were working yesterday. All organs of military management must be taken in hand. The competence, vigilance and responsibility of the cadres must be raised all round, and high final results in combat readiness must be ensured.

The time demands that we should all think in a new way, act in a new way, and achieve new, qualitative changes in everything and in every place, said Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The personnel of the Air Force is fully resolved to reach new achievements in the further improvement of their flying, weapon and tactical skills and the level of combat readiness of the units for the 70th anniversary of Great October. The Soviet people must have no doubts about the capability of the Soviet Air Force to be always on the alert in the interests of the security of the motherland and the countries of the socialist community.

The years pass. Many of those whose lot it was to begin service in the Air Force together and to fight in the war skies, in defense of the freedom and independence of the motherland, are now in the reserve. But it was they who laid down the basis of our modern Air Force and its glorious combat traditions. It was they who were the models of steadfastness, boldness and heroism in the battles for the motherland. And today, when we honor the winged batteries of the country, I should like to express particular gratitude and thanks to those veteran patriots for their contribution to the defense and strengthening of the aviation might of the country of soviets, for their active participation in military patriotic education of Soviet youth.

Dear comrades, I cordially congratulate you, veterans, military aviators, workers in the aviation industry and Aeroflot, sports fliers, and all the Soviet people on our remarkable traditional festival, the day of the Air Force of the USSR. I wish you good health, happiness, and success in the speedy implementation of the directives of the 27th party congress for accelerating the social and economic development of the country and strengthening its armed might. On this solemn day, the pilots, navigators, engineers, technicians and all aviation specialists of the Air Force assure the CPSU Central Committee, the Soviet Government and our people that they will put all their efforts into achieving a new standard of combat readiness and will carry out their patriotic and internationalist duty honorably and worthily. They will reliably stand guard over the gains of socialism and the sacred frontiers of our motherland.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON CARPATHIAN MILITARY EXERCISES

'High Level of Combat Training'

LD171505 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Text] Troops of the Order of Red Banner Carpathian Military District began their exercise today in the area of Rava-Russka, Yavorov, Gorodok, and Nesterov.

On the first day, the personnel of the units and subunits taking part in the exercise showed a high level of combat training and demonstrated a readiness to fulfill the tasks assigned them.

Will Work on 'Cooperation'

LD171916 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Aug 87

[Excerpts] As has already been reported, military exercises began today in the Red Banner Carpathian Military District. Our correspondent Anatoliy Ilchenko narrates:

[Begin recording] [Ilchenko] We are at one of the training centers of the Carpathian Military District. It has taken up an extensive area edged with coniferous forests and copses. There is peace and quiet here at the moment. [passage omitted] In the distance I see the rectangles of firing ranges, various engineering defense installations; and I see tanks set in positions. These machines which have come to the end of their service life will become targets for when the practice combat gets underway here.

What are the aims and tasks of these exercises? I address this question to Vladimir Ivanovich (Sounin), an officer at the headquarters of the Carpathian Military District.

[(Sounin)] These exercises are being conducted with the aim of perfecting the field training of forces: the working out of questions of cooperation and control.

[Ilchenko] What is the situation for today, the day of the start of the exercises?

[(Sounin)] Today, 17 August, according to plan, the troops began moving to places where they will form-up.

[Ilchenko] How much time will these maneuvers take?

[(Sounin)] These exercises will be taking place 17-22 August; and 17-19 August the troops will be moving into forming-up places. Troop action will begin 20-21 August, as was announced.

[Ilchenko] What kinds of action will take place?

[(Sounin)] Mainly defense actions of troops. The actions of troops will be backed up by artillery and aviation. The aim of these exercises is to work out questions of cooperation in approximate combat conditions.

[Ilchenko] Will foreign observers also be present here?

[(Sounin)] To date 24 countries have accepted the invitation. These are countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries.

[Ilchenko] Well, for the moment units and subunits of troops taking part in the maneuvers are taking up lines of departure. They are conventionally divided into blues and oranges. Who among them will display a higher level of combat and political training, who will best resolve the tasks set out by the command, will be shown in the next days of the exercises. [end recording]